

JPRS-TAC-86-055

15 JULY 1986

## Worldwide Report

# ARMS CONTROL

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A**  
Approved for Public Release  
Distribution Unlimited

**DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2**

19990422 109

**FBIS**

**FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE**

REPRODUCED BY  
NATIONAL TECHNICAL  
INFORMATION SERVICE  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

8  
63  
A04

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

15 JULY 1986

# WORLDWIDE REPORT

## ARMS CONTROL

### CONTENTS

#### U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

|  |   |
|--|---|
| FRG Press Reviews Foreign Minister's Geneva Speech<br>(Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network, 11 Jun 86) ..... | 1 |
|--|---|

#### SALT/START ISSUES

|  |    |
|--|----|
| TASS: Arms Negotiator Rowny Justifies U.S. SALT Violation<br>(Moscow TASS, 10 Jun 86) .....                  | 2  |
| USSR: Claims of Soviet SALT II Violations Rebutted<br>(Moscow in English to North America, 15 Jun 86) .....  | 3  |
| IZVESTIYA Likens Perle SALT Comment to Joseph McCarthy<br>(Moscow IZVESTIYA, 14 Jun 86) .....                | 9  |
| FRG Papers Comment on Reagan SALT II Declaration<br>(Various sources, various dates) .....                   | 11 |
| Press Review   | 11 |
| Newspaper Editorial  | 12 |
| Papers View Bundestag Debate, SALT   | 12 |
| Genscher on European, U.S. Views   | 13 |
| Press Analyzes Reagan's Statements   | 14 |
| Karpov Comments on Reagan SALT II Decision's Impact<br>(Hamburg ARD Television Network, 13 Jun 86) .....     | 16 |
| USSR's Falin on SALT II Decision's Impact on Summit<br>(Valentin Falin; Vienna VOLKSSTIMME, 14 Jun 86) ..... | 17 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Further Soviet Commentaries Assailing Reagan SALT II Decision<br>(Various sources, various dates) .....                             | 19 |
| Contradicts 1985 Summit, by Spartak Beglov  | 19 |
| 'Worst Conclusions' Confirmed, by Vladimir Bogachev   | 21 |
| U.S. Seeks 'Superiority', by Aleksandr Druzhinin  | 22 |
| Numerical Ceilings Discussed, by Leonid Ponomarev   | 22 |
| 'Blatant' U.S. SALT, ABM Violations, by I. Nikolayev  | 23 |
| 'Dangers' Listed  | 26 |
| SALT II Not Obsolete, by G. Dadyants  | 27 |
| U.S. 'Crushing' Treaties  | 30 |
| PRC People's Daily Views 'Storm' Over SALT Issues<br>(Zhang Liang; Beijing RENMIN RIBAO, 14 Jun 86) .....                           | 32 |
| Briefs  |    |
| TASS on Minuteman-3 Test  | 34 |
| EUROPEAN CONFERENCES  |    |
| FRG CDU/CSU 'Disappointed' With Pact Proposals<br>(Hamburg DPA, 11, 12 Jun 86; Cologne Deutschlandfunk<br>Network, 12 Jun 86) ..... | 35 |
| Todenhoefer Expresses 'Disappointment'  | 35 |
| Genscher's Remarks  | 35 |
| Vogel Welcomes Proposals  | 36 |
| Press on Disarmament Proposals  | 37 |
| RELATED ISSUES  |    |
| USSR's Bovin: U.S. Actions Intended 'To Block Summit Meeting'<br>(A. Bovin; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 24 Jun 86) .....                      | 38 |
| Moscow Views Shifting U.S. Response to Soviet Initiatives<br>(Aleksandr Zholkver; Moscow Domestic Service, 19 Jun 86) .             | 40 |
| TASS: U.S. Considers 'Insertable Nuclear Components'<br>(Moscow TASS, 16 Jun 86) .....  | 41 |
| TASS Reports on Pugwash Geneva Meeting<br>(Moscow TASS, 14, 17 Jun 86) .....  | 42 |
| Meeting Opens   | 42 |
| Urges Observance of SALT II   | 42 |
| Karpov Meets Leaders  | 43 |
| TASS: World Peace Council on UN Disarmament-Development Forum<br>(Moscow TASS, 9 Jun 86) .....                                      | 44 |
| Moscow Religious Round Table on Arms Race, Poverty<br>(V. Kondrashov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 26 May 86) .....                            | 45 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| TASS Reports on Socialist International Congress in Lima<br>(Moscow TASS International Service, 22 Jun 86; Moscow<br>TASS, 23, 24 Jun 86) ..... | 47 |
| CPSU Greetings  | 47 |
| Speakers Criticize Arms Race  | 50 |
| Congress Manifesto  | 51 |
| USSR: Physicians Against Nuclear War Hold Hiroshima Symposium<br>(Various sources, various dates) .....   | 52 |
| Worldwide Appeal, by Vykhukhalev  | 52 |
| Tokyo Press Conference  | 53 |
| Statement by Lown, Chazov   | 54 |
| Karpov Said To Head New USSR Foreign Ministry Arms Section<br>(Paris AFP, 17 Jun 86) .....  | 55 |
| CSSR Academician Addresses Moscow Forum on Peace, Environment<br>(Prague CTK, 28 May 86) .....  | 56 |
| USSR's Petrovskiy on Foreign Ministry Reshuffle, Arms Issues<br>(V. F. Petrovskiy Interview; Rome LA REPUBBLICA, 17 Jun 86)                     | 57 |

/9987

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRG PRESS REVIEWS FOREIGN MINISTER'S GENEVA SPEECH

DW110925 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 0505 GMT 11 Jun 86

[From the Press Review]

[Text] One of today's editorial topics is the UN disarmament conference in Geneva.

The Ulm *SUEDWEST-PRESSE* writes: Foreign Minister Genscher was right in making the demand for worldwide abolishment of chemical weapons the main point of his speech. After all, the FRG is the only European country in the Western alliance where such weapons are stored as a counterbalance to the Soviet chemical weapons potential. That sinister potential understandably creates fear — especially after Chernobyl. It gives the Bonn opposition an opportunity to score points against the Federal Government with the demand for a chemical weapons-free zone in Europe. It is in the interest of the FRG to press the United States and the USSR to achieve an agreement on the destruction of chemical weapons.

*MANNHEIMER MORGEN* maintains: The foreign minister's appeal is remarkable because it is directed mainly at the leading power of our own alliance, whose activities in the security field are causing increasing concern for the European partners. However, experience shows that Washington will not be particularly impressed by it. After all, the Geneva conference is the right forum for doing the necessary preparatory work for a worldwide ban on chemical weapons. As soon as a proposal is submitted, we will see how serious the superpowers are about their declared intentions.

*FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU* notes: Foreign Minister Genscher has outlined a concrete and clear route in Geneva. He considers time to be more than ripe eventually to achieve worldwide destruction of the chemical weapons potential. He is right in objecting to a more modest solution, the chemical weapons-free zones the SPD has in mind, because it would create more insecurity in areas that are not involved. It is remarkable that Genscher is steering such a clear course. However, in doing it he is contradicting Bonn's official attitude and the recent agreement on U.S. production of new binary weapons. However, that should not take anything away from Genscher's meritorious continuation of his policy on arms control.

15 July 1986

## SALT/START ISSUES

TASS: ARMS NEGOTIATOR ROWNY JUSTIFIES U.S. SALT VIOLATION

LD102236 Moscow TASS in English 2149 GMT 10 Jun 86

[Text] London, 10 Jun (TASS)--TASS correspondent Nikolay Pakhomov reports:

The SALT II Treaty "has outlived its usefulness" to Washington, and the U.S. stands to gain from the violation of its provisions, said Edward L. Rowny, special adviser to the U.S. President and secretary of state on arms control. He made this statement to a correspondent of the JANE'S DEFENSE WEEKLY.

Lifting the restrictions under the SALT II treaty would allow the U.S. to continue "modernizing" its strategic nuclear forces, the special adviser to the President said.

The point at issue, in real fact, is the U.S. plan for a further deployment of intercontinental ballistic missile "MX", creation of the mobile missile Midgetman, new cruise missiles to be carried in bomber aircraft.

The special adviser to the President was trying to justify the militaristic plans of the U.S. by totally groundless claims about "violations" of the SALT II Treaty by the Soviet Union. One of his arguments was that the USSR has created SS-25 ICBM (as the Soviet missile RS-12M is called in the West), but it is, in real fact, a modernized version of the missile "RS-12", which is permitted under the SALT II Treaty.

Commenting on the statement by Edward Rowny, the JANE'S DEFENSE WEEKLY pointed out that the NATO allies of the U.S. had expressed their protest at the latter's intention to end its compliance with the SALT II Treaty. Edward Rowny admitted that there were such sentiments among the West Europeans, but made it clear that the U.S. did not wish to reckon with them.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1437

SALT/START ISSUES

USSR: CLAIMS OF SOVIET SALT II VIOLATIONS REBUTTED

LD162229 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 15 Jun 86

["Top Priority" discussion program hosted by Pavel Kuznetsov with Prof Radomir Bogdanov and Prof Sergey Plekhanov of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute for United States of America and Canada Studies].

[Text] Hello, I am Pavel Kuznetsov, your host on today's edition of "Top Priority," a weekly panel discussion of major world events from the North American service of Radio Moscow. Together with me in the studio are Professor Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov of the Moscow based Institute for USA and Canada Studies. The topic for today's discussion is the decision by the American Administration to abandon the SALT II treaty later this year. The decision has cast a very dark cloud in my view over the arms control process, U.S.-Soviet relations, including the issue of a new Soviet-American summit and, as some Western observers believe, has thrown U.S.-West European relations into a disarray. The President's decision, described as a big victory for hawks and right-wing circles is explained as being inevitable in view of persistent Soviet noncompliance. Without assuming the role of a devil's advocate I'd like you to take a look at some of the American charges. Dr Bogdanov.

[Bogdanov] You know, first of all I would like to add to what you have said just now and to make it more serious than you did in the sense that to my mind this Administration tries to begin a new era, a Reagan era, or whatever you call it. They have destroyed the last remnants of the network, if you like, of the Soviet-American relations based on the treaty, SALT treaty, and I'm afraid that the second target or the third, if you like, the third target is ABM Treaty [of] 72. That's the preparation for that. I have been a student of that kind of set of accusations of the Soviet Union for so many years now, the so-called Soviet violations. Now they have summed it up in a very short form, you know, saying that the Soviet Union has been violating the SALT II treaty in three basic provisions. Number one: They have created, I mean the Soviet side, they, in violation of the treaty, they have created a new type of Soviet missile which is called SS by their terminology, SS-25, and by our terminology RC-12M.

The second accusation is that in violation of the provisions of the treaty we are over, (?over-recording), the telemetric information emitted during the tests by our new missiles, that the American side cannot, are not able to, pick up the real weight, whole weight, you know, the booster, and things like that.

And the third violation is very closely linked with ABM Treaty [of] 72, that's, near Krasnoyarsk we built a station which is, with phased, you know.

[Kuznetsov] Phased array.

[Bogdanov] Phased array, which is very clear indication that we are finishing the ABM defense. Three accusations. Now there is a fourth one which is debated in different American circles. Did the Soviet Union violate the level of SALT treaty?

[Kuznetsov] The total number of delivery vehicles?

[Bogdanov] The total of delivery vehicles, or not [word indistinct]. Let me start with the Krasnoyarsk station. It's still under construction it is still not finished, and we have informed the American side; we have told many times at the standing committee in Geneva, that gentlemen, please, for heavens sake, wait until we've finished that station, then by emission of the waves you will measure very easily; you will see very easily that it has nothing to do with ABM defense; it has to do with space, Soviet and American detections of objects in the space. Okay, I understand American worries, I understand American suspicions, that's why we have suggested to the American side a very businesslike approach: if you're so much for it, let's do it like that. You've built, building up, you Americans, two stations, but we believe really (?ABM) stations in Greenland and in England. If you are so much worried about ours we are ready to stop it immediately, the construction of that station -- but you stop yours.

[Kuznetsov] Actually, they are finishing one of them. I believe the other is in the planning stage, so it's not a total (?loss).

[Bogdanov] Yeah, yeah, but I mean, you know, if you are so much worried about it, you say that's the violation and you are not ready to wait until you've seen it in construction, that's our suggestion to you. Please, let's change, you know, one under construction for yours in Greenland. Isn't it a fair deal? I believe it's a fair deal. But if, of course, you have goodwill you know, if you are really inclined to tackle that problem.

[Kuznetsov] What can you say about the other two accusations against our country?

[Plekhanov] Well, the accusation about the two allegedly new missiles which are supposed to be a violation of the SALT II treaty, I can say that actually one missile is allowed, creation of one new missile is allowed by the SALT II treaty and there is such a missile in the Soviet Union, it's called RS-22, or SS-23 as it is known in the American parlance, or as NATO calls it. As for the second one, which Americans mention, SS-25, it's not a new one, it's a modernization of an old missile and such modernization is clearly within the limits allowed by the SALT II treaty. The reason why they bring up this ghost of the second new missile is because they are in the process of creating the second missile, Midgetman. They've already made a decision that they're going to create a Midgetman missile and in order to provide room for that they need that myth of the Soviet violations.

[Kuznetsov] There is something else they say. They say that modernization is when a new missile differs in payload from the old one, the one that's being modernized, by 5 percent and they claim that this SS-25 is different from the old one by 92 percent.

[Bogdanov] You know what's the trick? The trick is very simple and they never tell the public opinion about that. When we were testing the missile which was called SS-(?13) they never added to the weight of the missile the special, you know, testing devices.

[Kuznetsov] All kinds of measuring instruments...

[Bogdanov] All kinds of measurement instruments and things like that, quite heavy. Now in this case, in the case of SS-25, all of a sudden they're adding to the weight, to the weight of the missile all the measurement instruments which are beyond maybe 100, 200, 300 kg, you know. And when we tell them, and we've been explaining to them many times, in Geneva, through other channels (?at least) gentlemen, let us stop the testing, we will dismantle, we will remove that measurement instrument then you will see that SS-20 -- what you call SS-25 -- it's not beyond 5 percent allowed by the treaty. They say no.

[Kuznetsov] As far as the encryption goes, or the coding of telemetric signals during flight tests of missiles, I've come across a very curious observation by an American expert who said that when the Soviet Union asks the Americans what they need that's being denied to them in terms of this telemetric data they refuse to be specific.

[Plekhanov] Telemetry encryption is allowed by the SALT II treaty, and the United States does it too, but the problem is that the encryption does not involve those particular -- does not create problems for verifying the compliance to the SALT II treaty. That means certain data must not be encrypted. Well, the Soviet Union has been scrupulously observing those positions of the treaty. Since the United States has raised the point we offered serious businesslike discussions. Let's agree on what particular parameters worry you. Let's agree on a certain set of data which should not be encrypted and then help maintain the compliance. They refuse to do that, they refuse to do that because the simple fact is that they do not want this treaty. They wanted to see it destroyed.

[Kuznetsov] The situation with regard to SALT II is presented as a case of Soviet violations versus very strict compliance by the United States. How true is this? My question to you, Radomir.

[Bogdanov] Well, you know, as to the American compliance, you know as to the SALT II treaty they have begun to destroy that treaty, violate that treaty years ago. And we have put our grievances on the table several times at the standing committee in Geneva. And the most general gross violation of the treaty was deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe, that's gross violation. Then you have the same problem with the encryption, you have the same problem with the ABM Treaty, you have other problems with the cruise missiles, and so on and so on. Now you may put the question: Why, if you have so many American violations, why have you kept silent? No we never kept silent. We just never made it public, in a way, to not jeopardize the process of arms control. We always were talking about that at the special standing committee in Geneva meant for that.

[Kuznetsov] The standing Consultative Committee...

[Bogdanov] Consultative Committee to -- yeah -- you know. We were trying always to keep it within the limits of that committee because we were -- and I think we are quite right -- we were taking into consideration the fact that uninformed public opinion might be very easily misled, make very strong conclusions, because it's a very complex matter and so we are trying to exchange our, you know, grievances with the Americans, with the American experts around the table. And mind you, Pavel, if you asked them, the American experts sitting over there, and their leaders of the American delegations, I wouldn't like to mention their names, but you may come across a number of public statements asserting that the Soviet Union is strictly complying with the treaty and now they have the nerve to suggest that we were violating and whatever [words indistinct] their exploitation. But now it goes out like, you know, like something very sensational, you know: Ha, those Russians.

[Kuznetsov] This being the situation, why do you think the American officials keep insisting on a new Soviet-American summit? What do they expect to achieve?

[Plekhanov] I think that one reason why they are insisting on a summit, or making statements in favor a summit is that they're worried about the impact of their actions on the world public opinion and the American public opinion. You know, Geneva created new hopes. In Geneva there was a possibility of a relaxation of tensions, of some progress in arms control. But in the months since Geneva the U.S. Government has done so much damage to the arms control talks, to the whole international atmosphere. Because of a number of things that they've done, the atmosphere has worsened in Soviet-American relations. Those relations are now at a worse stage than they were a year ago.

[Bagdanov] And if you take into consideration all that you have said just now, we come to the conclusion that the American side is trying to use the summit meeting as a kind of a cover for the arms control...

[Kuznetsov] Do you suggest that they would like to talk for the sake of talking, without doing anything?

[Bogdanov] That's my suspicion, Pavel, to be frank with you. By one hand they are destroying everything in the arms control, they are killing the last remnants of the arms control, by the other hand they're creating an impression that they are dying for a summit which may, you know, bring improvement, something like that.

[Kuznetsov] What is the Soviet position with regard to a summit?

[Bogdanov] The Soviet position, you know, it is very simple: We have no conditions. We are ready to go. By the way, we have suggested twice to the American President to meet at any place in Europe to discuss a moratorium, stopping all tests immediately, anytime, any place. Now, but at the same time you know, to come over here just for the sake of shaking hands, or another smile. It's too expensive you know, and it's senseless.

[Plekhanov] And politically misleading.

[Bogdanov] And politically misleading, because as I told you already, and you may agree with me, that to use a summit, such an important thing, as a cover for a new arms race is absolutely dishonest, dishonest. So, if we are not sure that the summit may bring one or two substantial results in the security (?measures), that there is no improvement in the political environment which Sergey already has mentioned, it's (?my difficulty) really, how you can go over there, what for? To talk about what?

[Kuznetsov] Professor Plekhanov, a question to you. Just the other day I came across a very curious report saying that members of the House Armed Services Committee have said that the purported Soviet violations amount to a hill of beans in military terms and that the President was in danger of shooting himself in the foot over them. How can any government risk everything, put in jeopardy such things as national security, arms control, bilateral and multilateral relations, over a hill of beans?

[Plekhanov] I think that the reason why the Reagan administration has been so mindless in its approach to arms control and to the SALT II treaty is that they, for some reason, they believe that the United States will be better off in international politics if it does not bind itself with any kind of obligations to other countries. If it's just basing its policies on the military might that they have, on the economic power that they have, and if they just force others.

[Bogdanov] Sergey I'm sorry, don't forget star wars. I believe star wars plays a very important role, too.

[Plekhanov] That's right. You must have some trump cards. If you throw away the things which were valuable to your predecessors then you must have some trump cards, and they think that the SDI is their trump card, that they will be able to use that in order to force such conditions as they want. But that kind of a game is very reckless; it's bound to damage the interests of the United States itself, not to mention the interests of others. It's really shooting themselves in the foot.

[Bogdanov] Yes, Sergey, and I would like to add to that another aspect of the story which is trying to exhaust the Soviet Union economically. [Words indistinct] moralists, great moralists in Washington. They don't talk about that openly, but it is all [words indistinct].

[Plekhanov] Well, sometimes they even talk about it openly.

[Bogdanov] [Words indistinct] the Soviet Union are not able to sustain such an arms race, we will exhaust them to pieces. Where is the moral?

[Plekhanov] We have little time for technicalities in our program, but still there is one thing that deserves being seen as rather important. The Pentagon and the administration say that they are not seeking any superiority over the Soviet Union but just catching up with the Soviet Union in land-based weapons. The thing is, however, that the structure of the Soviet and American arsenals, strategic arsenals, is different. The majority of Soviet deterrents, or about 70 percent, is on land-based missiles while only 30 percent of the American nuclear forces is on land-based missiles.

Now their, the remaining, two legs are sea-based weapons on nuclear subs and long-range cruise missiles. When the American Administration says it will catch up and skips any mention of the other two legs of the triad, this, in my view, means that they are going to perpetuate their lead, that they are going out for a strong military lead in the strategic forces.

[Kuznetsov] That's right, and the problem's not only with the numbers, and by the way, the numbers of warheads on strategic missiles and bombers is now larger with the United States than with the Soviet Union. We call it a rough parity, rough parity because they have more warheads. But the important thing is not that, that it's not just the numbers of warheads. It's also things like accuracy, the way you deploy your forces. In that area the United States is clearly trying to achieve a configuration and a structure of their military forces, their nuclear potential, so as to be able to acquire a capability to disarm the Soviet Union in a preemptive strike. This is a mad theory. I mean really mad because, no matter how accurate your missiles are, you will never be able to disarm your opponent and the opponent will be able to strike back. So this, this is really nonsense. But the problem is that that nonsense is believed in very seriously, and policies are based on it, and that creates danger.

The decision to break out of the SALT II treaty by the end of the year fits very neatly, in my view, with the overall approach of the Reagan administration to arms control. Take such issues as nuclear testing, as reductions of conventional or chemical weapons as we propose. At the same time the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Treaty allies have once again come up with major peace offers in Budapest during a regular meeting of the Political Consultative Committee. These offers complement those that were already put forward in the past and including the Soviet plan of nuclear disarmament by the end of the century. Professor Bogdanov, what chances are there for these peace offers to succeed?

[Bogdanov] First of all, let's make it public for our listeners over there, and I believe that they should be well assured of the reality of that subject which is a very important one -- conventional arms, what to do with the conventional arms. But to be frank with you, I'm afraid that we will hear another "no" from Washington, as if the English language has no other word but it's a very, very rich language, because this administration has been programmed in that way. And they have started already a very dangerous process of destruction, destruction of the whole structure of the arms control network in the Soviet-American relations. Mainly, they're so ambitious that they want to please all of us with some comprehensive Reagan's plan of arms control and things like that. But you know, I do not believe that the way can be first to destroy everything, including the mutual trust and start something else when you have something like 3 years, or even less than 3 years left of this administration. It makes the whole show very, very doubtful, because, my suspicion is, whatever they are doing now has one aim -- to try to tie up the hands of the next administration, that the next administration carries on the so-called Reagan revolution in that field too.

[Kuznetsov] Thank you, our time is up. I'd like to thank you and the listeners and invite them to tune in again a week from now at the same time and on the same wavelengths. I am Pavel Kuznetsov, your host on "Top Priority," a weekly panel discussion of major world events.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1437

15 July 1986

## SALT/START ISSUES

## IZVESTIYA LIKENS PERLE SALT COMMENT TO JOSEPH MCCARTHY

PML80805 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jun 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Melor Sturua article: "In the Wake of McCarthy"]

[Text] Last Friday U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense Joseph Perle spoke at a dinner given in his honor by the "Heritage Foundation" private research organization--the think tank of U.S. extreme right-wingers. But surely Perle is called Richard, not Joseph, I hear the informed reader say. So he was. For some time now he has clearly changed name and will obviously change his surname to McCarthy too. Yes, yes, if this writer believed in the migration of souls he would not doubt for one minute that the soul of the late Senator Joseph McCarthy had migrated to Richard Perle's mortal body.

Friday's Heritage Foundation dinner is quite eloquent evidence of that. As is well known, McCarthy was famed for his "witch-hunts." His allegation that the U.S. State Department had virtually become a "nest of Communists" attained particularly scandalous notoriety. Mr Perle has followed the beaten track. After a pleasant dessert he made an absolutely indigestible statement, accusing the State Department of "preventing" the NATO leaders from being informed about "violations by the Russians of agreements in the arms control sphere and the need to continue U.S. nuclear weapons tests." Perle excelled himself. "It is simply disgraceful!" he exclaimed.

The cause of Perle-McCarthy's ire is the negative reaction of the U.S. European NATO allies to Washington's virtual denouncement of the interim SALT I agreement and the SALT II Treaty. Of course, it could have been suggested to Mr Perle that this position is the fruit of information rather than ignorance. But Mr Perle and the soul of McCarthy within him are not in tune with logic. That is why the "immune" members of his audience also got an earful.

After the State Department and the European NATO leaders Perle set about Congress, most of whose members are also not ecstatic about the speed with which people are violating highly important treaties. Speaking not at the Heritage Foundation dinner but at a stormy 4-hour hearing in one of the House Armed Services subcommittees, Perle issued this ultimatum: "Either Congress is in solidarity with the administration or it is in solidarity with

the Russians." Perle was particularly angered by a bill put forward by Congressman Norman Dicks of Washington envisaging the blocking of appropriations for U.S. nuclear arms, production of which will entail exceeding the SALT II limits.

Perle's eloquence, as THE WASHINGTON POST put it, made Dicks "red with anger." Answering Perle, Dicks said that the former was "making too bold in discussing the legislative and executive branches of authority." Dicks also reminded Perle that during his stint as aide to Senator Henry Jackson he had "outdone everyone in undermining" SALT II.

Congressman Thomas Downey of New York also joined in the combat. "Compared to you," he told Perle, "the character in George Orwell's '1984' whose task is to rewrite history is a babe in arms."

Congressman Downey was very close to the truth, very close. If Perle rewrites his surname as McCarthy and his first name as Joseph, that is his business. But when he and his bosses rewrite, or, rather, cross out international legal documents of the utmost importance on whose observance the fate of world peace largely depends, that is quite another matter. This is what Thomas O'Neill, speaker of the House of Representatives, said about him when summing up the results of the skirmish: "The administration has taken its foot off the brake on nuclear arms deployment and is about to step on the gas in nuclear weapons production."

That is why Mr Perle is now stepping on the gas of McCarthyism.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1437

SALT/START ISSUES

FRG PAPERS COMMENT ON REAGAN SALT II DECLARATION

Press Review

DW051015 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 0505 GMT 5 Jun 86

[From the Press Review]

[Text] One of today's editorial topics is the dispute about SALT II.

*LUEBECKER NACHRICHTEN* writes: The situation is paradoxical. For some 7 years ago the U.S. Government has adhered to SALT II, which had been achieved after long efforts, although it has not been adopted by the Senate. Today it is believed that a congressional majority would support the arms control treaty. However, now the White House does not want to have anything to do with it. In the West — in the United States as well as in Europe — the lack of understanding for the U.S. President's new course is taking shape as a political counterinitiative. Reagan must realize there will be growing resistance — in his own camp even more than from the Soviet Union. Neither the allies nor many members of Congress want to abandon SALT II as long as there are no substantial chances for a treaty limiting strategic weapons.

*SCHWARZWÄELDER BOTE* notes: The sharpest reaction to President Reagan's announcement that he does not feel bound by SALT II was heard yesterday from Moscow. Abandoning the treaty would jeopardize not only the planned second summit meeting between Reagan and Gorbachev, it could also touch off USSR military countermeasures, warned high-ranking officials. Whether the U.S. President had considered that possibility sufficiently when he let the Soviet Union know what it would have to expect if it did not act according to U.S. expectations remains a question.

The Freiburg *BADISCHE ZEITUNG* maintains: The angry Soviet reaction to the broadside fired by President Reagan at SALT II had been expected by the U.S. Government. However, it seems to be surprised by the extent of West European irritation. Now the U.S. Government is trying pacification, pointing out that it was not Reagan's final word, but that he has left a final decision on eliminating the SALT II restrictions open until the end of the year.

Newspaper Editorial

DW050942 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in German 5 Jun 86 p 3

[Editorial by "GRO": "Ice Age"]

[Text] SALT II never got through the U.S. Congress, it was never ratified, and thus it was never legally valid. In practice, however, it was the underlying basis for relations between the two superpowers. That seems to be changing radically now.

The deployment of "Eurostrategic" weapons systems (Pershing-2 and cruise missiles on one side, SS-20 missiles on the other) has aggravated tensions — as indicated by the protest movement and the opposition, but ignored by the Bonn coalition and the big brothers in Washington; however, it was not a question of SALT. There was still hope that the superpowers would still maintain what is called common sense.

A new cold war is in the offing. Ronald Reagan and particularly his secretary, Caspar Weinberger, want to see more weapons; they want to see SALT II disappear into the archives — shelved as "illusions" or "deceptions." Soviet Chief of General Staff Akhromeyev and the other Kremlin leaders will follow suit. At the end of the American's term in office, a president who has been praised for guaranteeing future peace, the most dangerous situation of postwar times is developing. The only question is whether it is the beginning of an ice age or the beginning of the end.

Papers View Bundestag Debate, SALT

DW061056 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 0505 GMT 6 Jun 86

[From the Press Review]

[Text] Some of the editorials today discuss the Bundestag disarmament debate.

*BRAUNSCHWEIGER ZEITUNG* writes: While the parties in the election campaign feel committed to stressing their differences, hardly anyone notes the occasional thing they have in common. The same was true in the Bundestag disarmament debate. All the factions shared uneasiness over the U.S. announcement that it would no longer adhere to SALT II. That is clearly expressed in the Bundestag majority decision addressed to Washington. As the Federal Government is fulfilling its alliance commitment loyally, in contrast to some other European allies, the U.S. Government cannot ignore the German voice. That voice also speaks to the East although, regrettably, with only half the volume. The SPD and the Greens do not want to join the appeal addressed simultaneously to the Soviet Union to slow its armament down so that the Americans will not implement their SALT II threat, which is connected to that condition. That is regrettable, because as a result German pressure to make the two major powers cooperate on disarmament will lose much of its conviction and political weight.

15 July 1986

**FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU** notes: Granted, the U.S. Congress never ratified SALT II, and it would have expired last year anyway. However, Moscow and Washington agreed to adhere to the agreed ceilings. There was some stability, despite the deteriorated U.S.-Soviet relations. It was at least a hope, but the American step came as a shock. What will follow now, is the question. Even more mass destruction weapons? An end to the arms control process? A new cold war? For a great number of Bonn politicians, even in the government parties, the recent U.S. action was somehow too much. CDU Deputy Volker Ruehe did not suppress his criticism. At any rate, the task of the defenders of U.S. policy has become more difficult.

The Bonn **GENERAL-ANZEIGER** states: In contrast to the Europeans, Washington sees no sense in sticking to SALT II if Moscow refuses to agree to verifiable disarmament steps in a constantly changing field as weapons technology. That is the core of the conflict of political opinion between the United States and its European allies.

#### Genscher on European, U.S. Views

LD071140 Hamburg DPA in German 1035 GMT 7 Jun 86

[Excerpts] Hagen, 7 Jun (DPA) — Hans-Dietrich Genscher, federal foreign minister, launched a sharp attack on the Greens at Hagen on Saturday at the North Rhine-Westphalia land FDP congress.

On energy policy, Genscher called for "increased efforts for research into nonnuclear sources of energy". These efforts were not good enough in the past. He regretted that "the publicly disbursed research funds for nuclear energy are considerably higher than those for nonnuclear energy". It would be correct to "alter this wrong relationship in favor of renewable energy sources."

The foreign minister regretted that the criticism by Europeans of the U.S. withdrawal from the SALT II treaty was misinterpreted in the United States. "What a misunderstanding of an alliance!" Genscher said. "We understand the alliance as a league of democracies, in which everyone can speak his mind. However imperfect" SALT II might be, the Federal Republic "would adhere to the agreement as long as there is no better one." (?It would be better) "if the United States and the USSR practiced what Reagan and Gorbachev stated in Geneva, namely the halving of their missile potential."

Press Analyzes Reagan's Statements

DW131001 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 0505 GMT 13 Jun 86

[From the Press Review]

[Text] Press editorials today deal with President Reagan's press conference given on Wednesday night in Washington. The United States attitude to SALT II was involved, which the president declared — literally — as being dead.

*AUGSBURGER ALLGEMEINE* comments on Reagan's attitude as follows: On the one hand he defended his decision, criticized by his allies, no longer to consider SALT II the ceiling for strategic weapons. On the other hand, however, he made it clear that the very last word had not been spoken. The aim is clear: Through some verbal muscle-flexing the Soviet Union is to become uncertain, end its alleged SALT II violations, and look to Geneva for disarmament compromises. Reagan can afford this game of poker. He is under no domestic political pressure, and demarches by European allies are currently not worth much in Washington anyway.

*DIE WELT* writes: The extraordinary care with which Ronald Reagan in his White House press conference dealt with Mikhail Gorbachev's goodwill, was more than diplomatic courtesy. It was a signal. Reagan praised the Kremlin chief as being the first Soviet Leader ever to suggest on his own the idea of reducing and even abolishing nuclear weapons. The President addressed his words to the tangibly cooler climate between Moscow and Washington. He did it at a time when many critics, in misinterpreting his Salt decision, accuse him of steering a confrontation course with Moscow and endangering the entire disarmament dialogue. The careful dealing with Gorbachev, the tangible leeway Reagan left for himself in the interpretation of his SALT decision, and the fact that the Soviets have made two new disarmament proposals since the Salt decision, proves that the predicted ice age is not in sight.

*KOELNISCHE RUNDSCHAU* maintains: Reagan is no more the unscrupulous warmonger than is Gorbachev the selfless angel of peace. The Americans have had problems for some time with SALT II, the invalid but respected treaty. Without much of an effort they could increase their military strike force considerably, but the agreement negotiated under Carter hinders them from doing it. At the same time they must endure the Soviet cavalier treatment of the agreement. The Russians deploy their SS-25 missiles and state stubbornly that it is not a new weapon development, which would not be permissible under SALT. There are a number of Soviet weapons initiatives suspected of being incompatible with Salt. Now the Americans want to catch up. However, it will certainly end in more than mere quantitative and qualitative equality.

The Leutkirch *SCHWAEBISCHE ZEITUNG* points out: The main question in view of Reagan's statements is what is mere tactics and what is usable substance? Before rebuilding detente, one should take stock carefully. During the negotiations on the SALT II agreement, Soviet missile production reached a peak. When the treaty was almost ready, president Carter withdraw the document after the invasion of Afghanistan. President Reagan now considers the never-ratified agreement as flawed. He demand a new agreement with reliable verification. That approach is honest and realistic — so much so that it must be painful to Europeans. The appeals of the European partners to the leading Western power to continue to adhere to Salt II are understable. From a German point of view it would even be logical. On the European border between East and West people live in densely populated areas that would be a battlefield if the East-West balance failed.

/8309

CSO: 5200/2706

SALT/START ISSUES

KARPOV COMMENTS ON REAGAN SALT II DECISION'S IMPACT

DW152157 Hamburg ARD Television Network in German 1800 GMT 13 Jun 86

[Interview with Viktor Karpov, head of the Soviet delegation to the Geneva disarmament negotiations, by correspondent Dierk-Ludwig Schaaf, in the Soviet Embassy in Bonn -- questions in German, answers in Russian with superimposed German translation -- recorded]

[Text] [Schaaf] The U.S. Administration reproaches the USSR with having violated SALT II.

[Karpov] That is a mere pretext. Now the U.S. armament program is beginning to be incompatible with SALT II. That is the real reason.

[Schaaf] What are the consequences for the Geneva disarmament negotiations if the U.S. Administration no longer accepts SALT II?

[Karpov] That will have extremely negative effects. Besides there is the U.S. intention to build the SDI program and to extend the arms-race into space. All that means considerable additional complications for the Geneva negotiations.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1437

SALT/START ISSUES

USSR'S FALIN ON SALT II DECISION'S IMPACT ON SUMMIT

AU161324 Vienna VOLKSSTIMME in German 14 Jun 86 p 3

["Excerpt" of an interview given by Valentin Falin, Soviet journalist and former USSR ambassador to the FRG, to Franz Sommerfeld, editor in chief of the FRG weekly DVZ/DIE TAT--date and place not given]

[Excerpts] Sommerfeld: The U.S. Administration is planning armament measures for autumn that would violate SALT II.

Falin: If this is confirmed, the entire arms control issue will be made much more difficult. This is the continuation of a negative development of the American policy, a development that constitutes a great danger to all of mankind.

Sommerfeld: Would this endanger the second summit meeting between Reagan and Gorbachev this year?

Falin: It would not make the second summit easier, that is obvious, if the Americans adhere to this policy, because the meaning of a new meeting between the general secretary and the President consists in solving problems and not in describing the problems and ensuing difficulties.

Sommerfeld: Has the spirit of Geneva disappeared?

Falin: In substance, yes. The American side has acted on purpose -- at least that it is how it seems -- in such a way that as little as possible is left of the spirit, and not only of the spirit but also of the letter, of Geneva.

Sommerfeld: Do you see any indications for a change in this development?

Falin: There are no indications for such a change.

Sommerfeld: So you are pessimistic?

Falin: Not pessimistic, but realistic!

The Americans Do Not Want an Understanding.

Sommerfeld: Does your assessment also apply to the disarmament negotiations currently under way?

Falin: The Americans want neither a settlement nor an understanding with us. They need tension in order to continue their military program. This is the real reason for the difficulties in all negotiations that are still being held. If they really wanted arms control, they would not question the existing agreements and treaties; they would pursue a totally different philosophy.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1437

SALT/START ISSUES

FURTHER SOVIET COMMENTARIES ASSAILING REAGAN SALT II DECISION

Contradicts 1985 Summit

AU091150 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 6 Jun 86 p 4

[Article by Spartak Beglov, "APN Political Observer: "'Ideology' and Missiles,"  
"especially written for RABOTNICHESKO DELO"]

[Text] In warning Washington that it could not remain indifferent to the refusal to observe SALT II, (as well as the SALT I agreement of 1972 on reducing strategic weapons), the USSR did not mean merely to underline the need to reject a new round of the arms race in the area of strategic nuclear weapons. This is so because the issue here is indeed the entire concept of international security at the threshold of the 21st century and the stability factors and strategic situation, the preserving and strengthening of which are vital to prevent the world from sliding toward a nuclear catastrophe.

Yes, this is no separate episode in the two states' relations in the military area. Gerhard Smith, one of the "godfathers" of the strategic weapons agreements, and a former leader of the U.S. delegation to the SALT I talks, has correctly assessed what has occurred. According to him Washington's intention to abandon in the final account observance of SALT II has an "ideological character," and has been adopted under pressure by opponents of disarmament.

Actually, what "ideology" can be mentioned when the issue in question is the arms production line? The matter is simple -- it is impossible to stop this production line while thinking in the old manner.

The "three whales" [referring to old Slav saying, according to which the world is supported by three whales] on which this "ideology" rests, professed by militarists of all periods, which have repeatedly brought tragic consequences for mankind, are these: The first -- power as the main issue in relations with other countries; the second -- you can develop your own security only at the expense of other countries' security; and third -- you must rely on military means, not on the political process, if you want to achieve real security.

Under the present U.S. Administration, whose high priest of the cult of power is Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger, this "ideology" has reached its apex. It was not by chance that on the eve of the November 1985 Geneva meeting between Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev, after unsuccessfully trying to foil the meeting, the

Pentagon chief in fact issued an ultimatum to the master of the White House, whose essence was that in Geneva a confirmation of the U.S. adherence to SALT II was to be avoided at all costs, if the support of the military and ultra-militarist circles was still wanted.

The Soviet leader's position upon arriving in Geneva was completely different: First: the survival of mankind depends on how profoundly everybody understands that cooperation among states must prevail over the arguments of power.

Second -- that the security of one state cannot be guaranteed without coordinating it with the interest of other states. Third -- that political decisions and the process of negotiating are the key to a reliable system of security throughout the world, and not the arms race for creating new generations of mass destruction weapons. After the Geneva meeting in the spirit of the new thinking, the USSR proposed a disarmament plan and a general system of international security. The confusion in the ranks of Washington's hawks developed into vicious resistance. It is not necessary now to list all the demonstrations of the U.S. policy of power that marred international life during the first half of this year.

The U.S. leading circles, which have close relations with the military-industrial complex, are trying to present things in a way that is aimed at creating the impression that there is no way out of the vicious circle of the arms race. Not only is the goal to discredit the Soviet peace program, but there is also a clear intention to impose on the USSR something like a "disarmament race." The essence of this intention is clear -- the Soviet program for radical measures in the area of disarmament is closely connected with the plans to sharply accelerate the country's development and double production and the people's prosperity by the end of the century.

According to the ideological canons of the U.S. "ultras," this is unacceptable. They see as the worst thing for themselves the fact that the new way of thinking, so brilliantly demonstrated by Moscow, would pull the rug out from under their feet. One cannot avoid the conclusion that the U.S. leading circles are not convinced that the historical dispute between the two systems will end in their favor, if this dispute continues under peaceful conditions. Simultaneously, the White House does not shun the use of the methods of "psychological war" even against its own population. Speculating with the lack of information of many Americans, the leading circles constantly disseminate myths about Soviet violations of SALT II. In fact, the new U.S. missiles have simply reached the "ceilings" of the agreement and have made it an uncomfortable one to have.

All this contradicts not only the spirit but also the letter of the Geneva meeting. Did the two leaders not sign a joint declaration in November 1985, on renouncing attempts to achieve military superiority? What has remained from Geneva for the next summit? Such a summit would make sense only if the situation preceding it corresponds to the character of the November 1985 agreements, and if it produces decisions on the great questions of security and stopping the arms race. Defending this position, Moscow expects Washington to produce signals in the spirit of the new thinking and not in the spirit of the obsolete "ideology" of confrontation, which has some very dangerous connotations. Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev said recently that the USSR is ready for compromise decisions, but will never succumb to pressure -- regardless of whether it is military, political, or economic.

'Worst Conclusions' Confirmed

LD131700 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1435 GMT 13 Jun 86

[Commentary by Vladimir Bogachev, TASS military affairs observer]

[Text] Moscow, 13 Jun (TASS) -- Washington has quite plainly stated that the United States is finally abandoning the 1979 Soviet-U.S. treaty on the limiting strategic weapons. "Salt II no longer exists. It is dead," White House spokesman Larry Speakes stated officially.

The very manner of presenting this decision by President Reagan to the world public confirms observers' worst conclusions of the genuine direction of U.S. foreign policy.

Certain critics of the President, who asserted that allegedly Reagan does not know where he is leading matters by virtue of his simplemindedness [po prostote dushevnoy], proved to be completely wrong.

Having already signed the decree on equipping 131 strategic bombers with cruise missiles, which means openly undermining SALT II, Reagan nevertheless made attempts to proceed with the renunciation of the treaty while keeping the brakes on. His contradictory statements, first about the willingness of the United States to violate SALT II, then the hints at the possibility of its being retained, and then finally the not too courageous decision to announce via a second-grade official that the treaty was finally being renounced, all indicate that the President knows full well what he is embarking on but is afraid of assuming responsibility for it.

The SALT II agreement has created a number of effective barriers to the nuclear arms race. It sets limits for both sides on the numbers of strategic weapon delivery vehicles, limited the number of warheads on long-range missiles, put a ban on obstacles to the operation of observation satellites, precluded the possibility of certain classes of particularly dangerous missiles being deployed, and made provision for a number of pledges by the sides whose observation reduced the danger of nuclear war.

Despite all the differences in the approaches by the USSR and the United States to problems of war and peace, up until 1981 there was a certain community of views between the sides regarding ways of maintaining stability and the danger of destabilizing the military-political situation. Previous U.S. Administrations recognized the risk of an absolutely uncontrolled nuclear arms race and tried to avoid situations in which vitally important decisions would have to be taken in just a few minutes during which events could get out of people's control. It was this very community of views on certain global problems that made it possible by 1979 to achieve a number of important agreements on curbing the arms race, including SALT II.

One gets the impression that the current U.S. Administration does not share the generally recognized views on the danger of a destabilization of the military-political situation and the catastrophic consequences of an uncontrolled arms race. This is precisely why it recklessly discarded the 1972 interim agreement [SALT I] and SALT II and is taking an action that jeopardizes the treaty on ABM system limitation, the banning of nuclear tests in the three environments, and the principles of activities by states in space.

Before the 1984 presidential elections the people close to Ronald Reagan constantly stressed in their public statements that the master of the White House wanted to go down in history as a peacemaker. It is now quite clear that either those statements were completely groundless, or else the President himself has decided there should be no history at all.

### U.S. Seeks 'Superiority'

LD121442 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 12 Jun 86

[Aleksandr Druzhinin commentary]

[Text] The impression is that the President's chief goal was to shield the United States of [as heard] the sharp criticism of its intention to undermine the SALT II treaty, voiced even by America's allies. Much was said at the news conference about Washington's desire to contain the arms race. However, the President admitted that he was always opposed to SALT II. In fact he confirmed that already this autumn American was going to go beyond the treaty's limits on the number of advanced cruise missiles to be deployed on B-52 bombers.

All this indicates that Washington's course towards torpedoing the treaty and crudely breaching the strategic parity between the Soviet Union and the United States remains unchanged.

Washington thinks of further building up its arsenals rather than of restraint, so vital for solving the problems of ending the arms race. This is borne out by a statement made by yet another high-ranking Washington administration official, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger. Addressing NATO's military officials recently, he said that the naval forces of the United States and its partners should expand the sphere of their actions to cover the world ocean as a whole. Mr Weinberger made it absolutely clear that Washington would rely in the future on the extensive armed support by NATO countries of American actions similar to the recent U.S. aggression against Libya. So as we see, Washington's intentions should be judged by its actions rather than by the Reagan administration's peace rhetoric. And these actions show that the escalation of the offensive arms race and reliance on global U.S. military superiority have always underlaid Washington's approach to international problems.

### Numerical Ceilings Discussed

LD171741 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1214 GMT 17 Jun 86

[TASS Observer Leonid Ponomarev: "Washington's Course -- Toward the Escalation of the Arms Race"]

[Text] Moscow, 17 Jun (TASS) -- Tomorrow marks the 7th anniversary of the signing in Vienna of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on limiting strategic offensive weapons, generally known as SALT II. Almost the same number of years passed before the document was signed. These years were spent on elaboration and careful assessment by each side on the "pros" and "cons" of the agreements. The 15th anniversary of the constructive process of concrete searches by the Soviet Union and the United States for accords on curbing the arms race could have been marked with satisfaction no later than in a year's time if the United States kept to the obligations it had undertaken, and the White House did not finally torpedo the treaty with its decision of 27 May to reject SALT II.

15 July 1986

What are the reasons for this? The fact is that the Pentagon approached that threshold when the SALT II accords stood as a rigid barrier on the path of building up the strategic capabilities of the United States.

- 9 It is true that SALT II also limits the level of strategic forces of the Soviet Union, but unlike Washington, Moscow welcomes these limitations for both sides, and is ready to lower the limits defined by SALT II.

U.S. Administration representatives claim that SALT II allegedly "does not limit" the build-up of strategic weapons, and Washington, so they say, would like to have "genuine control" over armaments. However, one only has to glance at the text of the treaty and it becomes clear that it most seriously limits the opportunities for increasing the strategic forces of the two sides and establishes their concrete "ceilings." Thus, the original total level was defined as 2,400 units of strategic weapons [yedinit's strategicheskikh sredstv] for each side, and if the treaty were ratified by the U.S. Senate, this level would be lowered to 2,250 units. Corresponding "ceilings" are also envisaged for the main groups of strategic systems -- 1,320 units for ballistic missiles with multiple independently-targeted reentry vehicles and for heavy bombers with their armaments; 1,200 units for ballistic missiles (without bombers) with multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles; finally, no more than 820 units of ICBM's with multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles.

From the moment of signing the treaty the Soviet Union dismantled 72 ICBM launchers and 21 heavy bombers, and overall dismantled 540 strategic carriers according to the provisional SALT I and the SALT II agreements. The United States dismantled 168 units. If no limitations existed according to SALT II, each side could increase the number of warheads approximately from 6,000 to 28,000 by the year 1995, according to the estimates of the research service of the U.S. Congress.

Having discarded SALT II, the present U.S. Administration is promising the public that it will strive for "a better treaty" with the Soviet Union "for the purposes of limiting arms arsenals." These are simply words, a propaganda ploy. By "a better treaty" Washington means a screen ensuring that the United States achieves military superiority over the Soviet Union. But these are illusory calculations since the USSR will never allow the United States to have nuclear missile superiority. In its international relations, including with the United States, the Soviet side rigorously holds by the principle of equality and identical security for the sides.

#### 'Blatant' U.S. SALT, ABM Violations

PM171611 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jun 86 First Edition p 4

[I. Nikolayev article: "Irresponsible Policy"]

[Text] Following President Reagan's 27 May statement on the de facto U.S. refusal to observe in the future the obligations stemming from the Soviet-American legal treaty documents on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons, no doubt at all remains that the present U.S. Administration has taken a course of eliminating the last real obstacles in the way of an unrestrained arms race, primarily in the sphere of mass destruction weapons. We are talking about the 1972 Interim Agreement and the 1979 SALT II Treaty, which prevent the U.S. leadership from embarking on a new round of the arms race and extending it into space -- which would threaten mankind with what are essentially irreversible consequences.

The 31 May Soviet Government statement has already given a principled assessment of these U.S. Government actions. One ought, however, to pay particular attention to one fact. As a justification for its irresponsible policy, U.S. diplomacy makes unsubstantiated references to some "violations" of the aforementioned legal treaty documents by the Soviet side. The Soviet side has already and repeatedly provided detailed and specific explanations of the alleged violations of these treaties, convincingly refuting these accusations as totally groundless. There is no need to turn back to this here.

There is, however, another aspect to this question. While accusing the Soviet Union of nonobservance of SALT II obligations, the Americans have themselves repeatedly given highly serious grounds for doubt regarding their observance of the obligation undertaken by the United States to adhere to the SALT II provisions, the accords reached under the 1972 Interim Agreement, and -- and this is equally dangerous for peace -- the most important provisions of the ABM Treaty of unlimited duration. The U.S. behavior cannot be described other than as a crude violation by the U.S. side of obligations it has undertaken, as irresponsible and extremely dangerous actions shaking the very foundations of the process of limiting the arms race.

#### U.S. Actions Contrary to the SALT II Treaty and the 1972 Interim Agreement:

By deploying Pershing-2 ballistic missiles and long-range cruise missiles in West Europe, the United States is acting contrary to Article XII of the SALT II Treaty which prohibits the circumvention of its provisions in any manner.

In the course of the talks, the sides agreed that circumvention means any action leading to a disruption of the strategic balance established by the treaty. The Pershing-2 and cruise missiles being deployed in Europe and capable of reaching Soviet territory are strategic weapons with respect to the Soviet Union, and the potential of these weapons is in no way inferior to that of ICBM's, SLBM's, or ALCM's defined by the sides as strategic weapons. Building up an additional strategic potential in evasion of the strategic balance established by the SALT II Treaty, the United States is in direct breach of the treaty by carrying out an action prohibited by its Article XII.

Work whose nature makes it possible to assume that an ICBM launch silo is being constructed there is being carried out at the Warren missile base in the United States. A special cover has been set up over the work site, preventing Soviet national technical means from observing the work. This provides sufficient grounds for asserting that at the Warren base, the American side is violating the provisions prohibiting the construction of additional stationary ICBM launchers and the disguising of work being carried out.

The American side followed the practice of using covers over launch silos back in the seventies, in defiance of the Interim Agreement. At that time, the United States concealed the nature of the reequipping of Minuteman-2 ICBM launch silos. After being reequipped, they hardly differ in any way from Minuteman-3 launchers. This, according to all the rules of military logic, indicated that the United States had prepared them to house precisely Minuteman-3's as MIRV'D missiles.

The United States does not wish to be tied down in any way on procedural issues either. Thus, in dismantling the Titan-2 silo launchers, it is simply ignoring the compulsory procedures elaborated by the sides to ensure monitoring of observance of the treaty's provisions. It is clear that this in no way promotes confidence in the fulfillment of the pledges adopted by the United States.

## U.S. Actions at Variance with the 1972 ABM Treaty:

The ABM Treaty of unlimited duration, signed by the U.S. president and ratified by Congress, obliges both sides not to deploy ABM systems for a defense of their national territories and not to create a base for such a defense. The ABM Treaty is undoubtedly the most important of the treaty bases on which all existing strategic arms limitations rest. Of course, without limitations on the ABM systems which constitute its substance, it is no use even thinking of any real measures aimed at limiting strategic offensive arms.

Even if we do not dwell on the declarative U.S. intentions to renounce the ABM Treaty in the near future, there are considerable grounds for describing certain actions already taken by the United States as direct and blatant violations of the ABM Treaty by the American side. In addition, there are grounds for assuming that the United States is already taking steps directed against this treaty.

Thus, the U.S. Administration proclaimed and adopted the SDI program, whose chief aim is the creation [sozdaniye] of an ABM defense of U.S. national territory with prohibited space-based elements. This aim is directly opposed to the chief substance of the ABM Treaty -- the prohibition of an ABM defense of a country's national territory and also, in particular, of space-based components. Tens of billions of dollars have been allocated to work on implementing these programs. A number of Western states are involved in implementing them internationally. A number of large-scale experiments have already been conducted, and they undoubtedly go beyond what might still be termed "research work," which, as the Americans understand it, is "not prohibited by the treaty." Thus, violations, of a number of basic provisions of the ABM Treaty in the course of implementing the American SDI program are quite obvious.

Against a background of loud talk about the supposed creation in the USSR of radar stations intended for territorial ABM systems, the United States itself for some years now has been deploying, both on its territory and abroad, large radar stations of the "Pave Paws" type with parameters virtually indistinguishable from those of ABM radar stations. Such stations are deployed both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of America and are quite capable of serving as the basis for the creation of ABM defense for the whole of U.S. territory. The creation of the large phased array radar station at Thule (Greenland) may be cited as an instance of a U.S. breach of the ABM Treaty. This construction is being carried out contrary to the provision of the ABM Treaty, which permits the deployment of a radar station of this type only on the periphery of a country's national territory. The construction of a similar radar station is also planned in the Fylingdales region in England.

Despite repeated Soviet representations to the U.S. side in connection with the deployment of the aforementioned radar stations, the latter has taken no measures capable of allaying concern, nor is it dismantling the Thule radar station, whose deployment can only be termed a violation of the ABM Treaty. When speaking about those U.S. actions in breach of the ABM Treaty, mention must also be made of the tests of MIRV'D warheads intended for ABM missiles, the creation of ABM radar stations, and the tests of an ABM missile created on the basis of ICBM's.

The list of U.S. violations of agreements on the limitation of strategic offensive armaments and the ABM Treaty could go on. But the examples that have been cited are sufficient to draw a clear and simple conclusion. The U.S. actions aimed against those treaties are neither coincidental nor uncoordinated and isolated. They adequately reflect the entire U.S. aggressive militarist policy based on the illusory pursuit of unilateral strategic advantages and represent a futile attempt to ensure America's own security and stability at the expense of others by means of an unrestrained arms race. Such a policy threatens unpredictable consequences for all mankind.

15 July 1986

## 'Dangers' Listed

LD191500 Moscow TASS in English 1444 GMT 19 Jun 86

["Foundation of Detente Should Not be Destroyed" -- TASS item identifier]

[Text] Moscow, June 19 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev

In the communique of the Budapest meeting, the Warsaw treaty member countries once again reaffirmed their adherence to the agreements in the sphere of arms limitation and disarmament and urged the United States to observe strictly the agreements on strategic arms limitation.

But the U.S. Administration refuses to heed the voice of reason, persists with its policy aimed at destroying the foundation of the process of detente, the foundation that had earlier been created by joint efforts of the two states for the further advance in arms reduction and limitation. The decision announced by the head of the White House to refuse to observe the Soviet-U.S. legal documents on strategic offensive arms limitation means an action that imposes a serious qualitative change on the international situation.

What are the dangers posed by this unilateral step by Washington? First, a deliberate large-scale breach of the provisions of the SALT-2 treaty attests to Washington's discarding the fundamental principle of the Soviet-U.S. relations -- the principle of equality and equal security on which this treaty rests. This means an outright attempt to achieve military advantages, to disrupt the military parity reached by the USSR and the USA, the parity which is the basis of strategic stability in the world.

Second, dismantling the existing material restrictions on the arms race, the United States opens the way for the uncontrolled build-up of armaments, thus jeopardizing the security of everyone, its own included. Resuming actually all military programmes which were dropped for some or other reasons by the previous administrations and embarking on the programme of the construction of heavy arms in all components of the U.S. strategic triad, the programme unprecedented for its scale, the present U.S. Administration discards the commitments assumed by those administrations as they come into contradiction with the implementation of the new U.S. military programmes.

Third, by its actions official Washington actually restricts the possibility of advance along the road of arms limitation and reduction. The U.S. Administration has done absolutely nothing to take practical measures for the implementation of the aim jointly proclaimed by the USSR and the USA -- that of terminating the arms race on earth and preventing its spread to space. Due to the efforts of the U.S. Administration, the Soviet-U.S. Talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva are skidding. The U.S. stand sharply complicated the matters at the talks, specifically in the group on strategic arms. Despite the growing indignation in the world and condemnation of Washington's policy, the U.S. Administration has no wish to adjust it in a positive direction. U.S. Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger just said that the SALT-2 treaty is "dated" and threatened the U.S. Congress that if it adopts a resolution on keeping within the quantitative limits set by the treaty, the President will be viewing it as unconstitutional. The Pentagon's chief confirmed again that another important treaty, on the limitation of ABM systems, is also threatened. He said he would declare against any steps that could limit the U.S. right to terminate the observance of that treaty. They in Washington refuse to realize their responsibility to the present and coming generations. And it is high time to understand that the negative stance of the U.S. Administration on key questions of war and peace is fraught with grave consequences for humanity and really threatens to turn our planet into a lifeless spectre.

## SALT II Not Obsolete

PM231341 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 20 Jun 86 p 3

[Own international observer G. Dadyants answers readers' questions under new rubric "Dialogue With Readers": "Après Eux le Deluge;" first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Today we are opening a new rubric in our international section. We will conduct a direct dialogue with readers on key questions of international politics. Professor V. Gul, doctor of chemical sciences and RSFSR meritorious figure of science and technology (Moscow), has addressed a number of questions to the editorial office, including some controversial questions about SALT II, G. Dadyants, SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA international observer, answers the questions.

Gul: A great deal is being written in the newspapers at the moment about U.S. violations of the Soviet-American SALT II agreement. I would like to ask the following question: How important is the observance of this treaty in present conditions when new talks on the whole range of nuclear and space arms are under way between the USSR and the United States? Perhaps SALT II is indeed obsolete. And, is this perhaps an attempt on the part of the United States to blackmail the Soviet Union in order to gain concessions at the talks?

Dadyants: No, SALT II is not obsolete. Furthermore, the observance of the treaty is obligatory particularly and especially in light of the new Soviet-American talks currently under way in Geneva. What is the essence of SALT II? Above all, this treaty imposes quantitative limits on strategic offensive arms -- the most dangerous and powerful nuclear weapon in the possession of the USSR and the United States. In particular, this treaty sets a strict limit on the number of strategic weapon delivery vehicles equipped with MIRVed warheads for both sides (1,320 units each). This limit as such contains the strategic arms race and therefore facilitates further talks on this question. I would like to mention in this context that the USSR has proposed that the strategic nuclear potential of both sides be reduced by 50 percent of the current level. According to the latest "interim option" introduced by the Soviet side in Geneva, strategic offensive arms are limited to equal levels on both sides. It is within the framework of SALT II that agreement on the further reduction of the strategic nuclear arsenals be sought.

Now, concerning U.S. intentions to violate the treaty, the American side has indeed announced this. First, this was declared by President R. Reagan himself and, subsequently, in still more unequivocal terms by Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger. This Pentagon "hawk" went so far as to describe SALT II as "flawed." Now U.S. spokesmen are openly saying that the treaty is "dead" and that, as far as the United States is concerned, it "no longer exists."

Is there an element of blackmail against the Soviet Union in this? Even that cannot be excluded. Nonetheless, I believe that in this case it is not so much a question of blackmail. Rather it is a question of the U.S. Administration's intention to accelerate the nuclear arms race across the board, including the strategic arms race. The 1979 SALT II treaty and the 1972 Interim Agreement Limiting Offensive Strategic Arms (SALT I) are an impediment to the U.S. aggressive neoglobalist policy. It is no accident that the decision to abandon the observance of SALT II was adopted to the accompaniment of the reverberations of new nuclear explosions in Nevada. It is closely tied up with the desire of the United States to rid itself of another important Soviet-American treaty -- the ABM Treaty -- which hampers the implementation of the SDI [Strategic Defense Initiative] program, referred to as "star wars" in common parlance.

A true arms race orgy, including the sphere of strategic arms, has broken out in the United States. In addition to B-52 and B-1B bombers equipped with long-range cruise missiles, it is intended to create [sozdat] a new type of ICBM (Midgetman) and deploy additionally 50 new MX ICBM's. As a result, the U.S. press admits, the limits imposed by SALT II will be exceeded. There is also talk about the creation [sozdaniye] of the "latest cruise missile." Preparations for the creation [sozdaniye] of space-strike arms are proceeding at full speed.

While programs of this kind are being implemented there is no room for international treaties. SALT II -- which incidentally was the result of many years of cooperation between the USSR and the United States in the seventies with a view to ending the nuclear missile arms race and strengthening strategic stability -- is a thorn in the flesh of the present U.S. Administration. Therefore it has decided to abandon it.

Gul: To what extent is SALT II being observed by both sides?

The Americans, for instance, are claiming that the USSR has repeatedly violated this treaty.

Dadyants: No, the Soviet side has not violated this treaty. The Soviet side has implemented and is implementing all its assumed obligations rigorously and in full, the Soviet Government statement on the subject says: In an attempt to justify its own position, Washington is claiming that the USSR "violated" the treaty by deploying two new ICBMs, which is not allowed under the treaty. In effect what they are referring to as "new ICBMs" is the modernized SS-25 missile. I must mention that, while imposing quantitative limits on strategic weapon delivery vehicles and warheads, the treaty by no means bans the modernization of the sides' nuclear potential. Thus the deployment of the missile referred to as the SS-25 in the West is fully within the confines of the treaty. I must also mention that since the signing of the treaties on strategic arms limitation, the USSR has dismantled 72 ICBM launchers and 21 heavy bombers -- a total of 540 delivery vehicles under both the SALT I and II treaties. Over the same period the United States has dismantled only 168 delivery vehicles.

In general it must be said that the United States has long been working toward undermining the strategic arms limitation treaties. It is generally known that SALT II was never ratified by the United States and was observed as a kind of "favor." The deployment on the territory of West European countries of the so-called new "medium range" U.S. missiles -- the Pershing-2 and cruise missiles trained on targets in the Soviet Union -- was clearly undertaken in circumvention of the treaty.

Gul: Our press wrote that the deployment in Europe of the new U.S. missiles was an outflanking maneuver on the part of the United States that was a breach of SALT II. Yet, the Americans have claimed that they sited these missiles in retaliation to the Soviet Union's deployment of SS-20 missiles. It would be nice to clear this up once and for all.

Dadyants: You mean explain why the Soviet Union's deployment of the SS-20 missiles to which the U.S. Administration is referring in its attempts to justify the deployment of the Pershing and cruise missiles was not a violation of SALT II, whereas the deployment of the U.S. missiles is a violation? Well, the reason is very simple: The Soviet SS-20 missiles cannot reach U.S. territory and therefore are not a strategic weapon in respect to the United States, while the U.S. Pershing and cruise missiles can reach Soviet territory and consequently are a strategic weapon where the USSR is concerned. Not to see this fundamental difference is to ignore the geographical position of the USSR and the United States.

Although the deployment of the Pershing-2 and cruise missiles was in fact a violation of SALT II, the USSR did, with a view to facilitating the quest for acceptable solutions, agree to regard these missiles as "medium-range" missiles and to discuss them separately. I would like to mention that in his 15 January statement, M.S. Gorbachev proposed that in addition to the 50 percent reduction of the Soviet and U.S. strategic potential, all medium-range missiles in Europe, both Soviet and American, be removed. We went even further to accommodate the West by agreeing that British and French nuclear weapons could be left off the Soviet-American "balance sheet." Yet these weapons are also targeted on our country. As you can see, we are making concessions to the West in an effort to find ways toward an agreement, but Washington and its NATO allies are, unfortunately, constantly blocking these measures.

Cul: At the NATO foreign ministers' session in Canada the U.S. NATO allies expressed disagreement with President Reagan's decision to violate SALT II. To what extent were their protests sincere?

Dadyants: In my opinion, it is not important now how sincere these protests were but, rather, how effective they will be.

True, U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz found himself "utterly isolated" in Canada. Without exception, all the U.S. NATO allies opposed the U.S. intention to torpedo such an important mechanism for containing the nuclear arms race as SALT II. However, matters are not going beyond protests. None of the U.S. allies asked, for instance, as a sign of protest against the steps of the U.S. Administration, to have the Pershing and cruise missiles removed from Europe. Furthermore, British nuclear submarines are to be equipped with U.S. Trident systems -- a strategic weapon -- that the United States is placing in British hands. Nor should one entertain any illusions concerning France, which claims the "independence" of its nuclear forces. Personally, I take a skeptical view of the "rebellion on knees" stated by the U.S. NATO allies against the R. Reagan administration's intention to violate SALT II. Using a sporting metaphor, they are denouncing the United States for breaking the rules of the game too blatantly, but they nonetheless still "support" the U.S. team.

Cul: What specific measures will the Soviet Union adopt in response to the violation of SALT II by the United States? Why, despite the meeting in Geneva, is the U.S. side behaving so provocatively in the international arena? Will a new Soviet-American summit be held in view of the U.S. violation of its obligations?

Dadyants: Well, first, SALT II has yet to be violated (R. Reagan has scheduled the U.S. "exit" from the treaty for the end of the current year). It is possible that the numerous protests both in Europe and in the United States itself will induce President Reagan to look before he leaps (our press cited many utterances by prominent U.S. politicians critical of the stance adopted by the administration (regarding the treaty). However, if the treaty is violated, we will, of course, adopt the appropriate measures to strengthen our security. As the Soviet leadership has emphasized on more than one occasion, we will not allow the Americans to disrupt the military strategic parity. In other words, we will pay them back in their own coin.

At present, of course, it is not just the purely military aspect but also the political aspect of the matter that is of concern. It is not only a question of SALT II but rather of the whole range of Soviet-American relations. The United States does not want to join the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions and is conducting one new test after another in Nevada. It occupies an unconstructive position at the aforementioned talks

15 July 1986

on nuclear and space arms in Geneva, and it is fueling anti-Soviet hysteria. Even the tragedy at the Chernobyl AES was exploited to exacerbate the international atmosphere. The U.S. leaders' gambling on brute force, the nuclear fist, and terrorist brigandage in combination with ideological intolerance and hatred can only be explained by a total disregard for present realities. All this, as you correctly noted, casts doubts on the prospects for a new Soviet-American summit. "The legitimate question arises," M.S. Gorbachev said in his report to the CPSU Central Committee June (1986) Plenum, "whether Washington really wants a new meeting or whether all the talk about it is just an attempt to mislead world public opinion."

The press, including the Western press, is increasingly writing about the recklessness and irresponsibility of the policy of the present administration that puts the interests of its military-industrial elite above the interests of the world and even above the interests of the security of the U.S. people themselves. One foreign newspaper defined Reagan's policy as follows: "Apres moi le deluge" ["After me, the flood"]. I recall that these words are attributed to the French King Louis XV, whose court was notorious for its dissipation and extravagance. This dissipation and extravagance was followed by the great French bourgeois revolution, and Louis XV's successor, Louis XVI, lost his head on the guillotine. The present rulers of America will, of course, not be there forever, but what will they bequeath to their country and mankind as a whole? They are clearly working toward a "universal deluge" -- toward an all-embracing nuclear catastrophe.

It is the task of all people of goodwill, and that means you and me, to avert this catastrophe.

#### U.S. 'Crushing' Treaties

LD231738 Moscow TASS in English 1646 GMT 23 Jun 86

["Maintain SALT Process and Strengthen Stability on Earth" -- TASS item identifier]

[Text]: Moscow 23 June TASS -- TASS Military News Analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

Like an elephant in a china shop, the U.S. Administration continues to crush one after another the agreements, reached in the sixties-seventies, on reducing the risk of nuclear war. By abandoning the 1972 interim agreement [SALT I] and the SALT-2 treaty and by putting in jeopardy through its actions the agreements on the limitation of ABM systems, on the principles governing the activities of countries in outer space, and a number of other accords, Washington delivers a blow on the very idea of curbing the arms race through negotiations and brings the world closer to the danger line beyond which full destabilisation of the military-political situation, fraught with the risk of a disastrous war, would begin.

Over five and a half years of the stay in office the present U.S. Administration has managed to derail more accords than the number of those remaining in force now. Washington seriously undermines its reputation of a negotiating partner and throws doubt upon readiness to observe the last remaining partial test ban treaty and the treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The U.S. actions confirm the earlier existing serious misgivings as to whether the U.S. side wants any new agreements altogether.

The SALT-2 treaty became the result of a reasonable compromise agreed upon by the sides. Striving to ensure real barriers to a nuclear arms build-up, the USSR went to meet the U.S. side over a number of questions in 1979. In particular, after ratifying the SALT-2 treaty the Soviet side was to reduce the number of its strategic delivery vehicles by ten percent. U.S. specialists highly appreciated the SALT-2 provisions for the limitation of the number of warheads on ballistic missiles, the so-called rules for counting MIRVed missiles and on banning interfering with the functioning surveillance satellites and on limiting the number of heavy ICBMs. The Pentagon's report for the 1981 fiscal year pointed out that the USA should admit that the SALT-2 for a number of reasons was meeting U.S. interests.

The USSR was scrupulously fulfilling all its obligations under the concluded treaties, including SALT-1 and SALT-2. Nonetheless Washington decided to abandon further adherence to the treaties. What are the causes of this decision of the Reagan administration? The point is that the strategic arms limitation agreements are based on the principle of U.S. plans aimed at achieving military superiority. Washington decided to sacrifice the security interests of its own people in order to try to wear out the Soviet Union economically, to weaken the influence of the socialist camp upon the cause of peace and social progress, and to regain the U.S. lost positions. These calculations are built on sand.

The U.S. military-political elite and its adventuristic conduct in the world arena pose an unprecedented threat to peace on earth and to the security of the United States itself. The arms race brings in huge profits to monopolies and to the military industrial complex. Herein is one of the main cause of the piling up of new and new U.S. systems for mass annihilation. The U.S. actions to upset the established rough parity are sure to give rise to appropriate counteraction on the part of the Soviet side. The USSR will not allow a U.S. nuclear-missile superiority.

Coming forward with new peace initiatives, which have been supported by the world public, the Soviet Union hopes that the United States Government will weigh once again the measure of responsibility it assumes by taking a decision leading to a break-up of the SALT process, and will draw appropriate conclusions while there is still time.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1437

SALT/START ISSUES

PRC PEOPLE'S DAILY VIEWS 'STORM' OVER SALT ISSUES

HK150342 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese 14 Jun 86 p 6

["Roundup" by Zhang Liang: "The Storm Around SALT"]

[Text] A new storm has arisen between Washington and Moscow in the past few weeks. This was touched off by the U.S. decision no longer to adhere to SALT-II. This development has without doubt cast a shadow over the U.S.-Soviet disarmament talks at Geneva and has also increased the tension in relations between the two countries. This American intention was announced by President Reagan in a statement on 27 May. Reagan said that in the future the United States must decide on the structure of its strategic forces in light of the degree of the threat posed by the Soviet strategic forces, and would no longer be bound by the SALT. The reason for this was that the Soviet Union had violated this treaty. However, his words left some room for maneuver, in that he expressed the hope that the Soviet Union would make use of this period to take constructive measures to stop violating the treaty; in that case, the United States would reconsider the matter.

The Soviet Union promptly reacted strongly to this American announcement. It denounced it as "an attempt to wreck the military balance," and warned that the Soviet Union "would not be unconcerned" over this move. If the United States failed to adhere to the treaty provisions, this might make the second U.S.-Soviet summit scheduled for this year fizzle out.

This expression of attitude by the U.S. Government caused serious disquiet in America and also among the Western allies. Now, when there has been no progress at all in the U.S.-Soviet arms control talks, the official U.S. announcement that it will no longer adhere to SALT-II will undoubtedly whip up a new round of the nuclear arms race. According to reports, the majority of congressmen do not agree with the government's decision, and some of them have even made plans for legislative moves to force the Reagan administration to continue to adhere to the treaty. At the recent conference of NATO foreign ministers, the foreign ministers of various countries put pressure on the United States by appealing to it not to abandon SALT-II. In the face of these pressures, President Reagan defended and explained his administration's decision at his 11 June press conference, to reassure the country and the Western allies. Reagan stated that if the Soviet Union could take the correct action, he might retract his decision to break through the SALT restrictions.

The U.S.-Soviet SALT was signed in 1979 during the administration of President Carter. After the treaty was signed, there were always differing views on it in the United States, and later the treaty was shelved by Congress and has never been ratified, due to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The Reagan administration has always taken a

negative attitude toward the treaty since it came to power. Due, however, to various domestic and external factors, Reagan has guaranteed that "so long as the Soviet Union displays corresponding restraint, we will not violate the existing arms control agreements."

However, the United States and the Soviet Union have constantly bickered and accused each other of violating the treaty over the past 7 years. In the recent period of time, Reagan submitted a detailed report to Congress listing Soviet treaty violations, and in particular accusing the Soviet Union of having produced and deployed new type-2 SS-25 intercontinental missiles, building a new radar station in Siberia, continuing to use secret code in missile testing with the aim of hampering verification, and so on. For its part, the Soviet Union has denied this and has in turn accused the United States of breaking the treaty provisions on many occasions, such as by exceeding the stipulated number of multiwarhead missiles, building missile-launching silos on land above the stipulated number, deploying Pershing-II and cruise missiles in Western Europe, and so on.

However, there are other reasons why Reagan chose the present moment to threaten to scrap the treaty. According to analysis by foreign press and publications, the United States may have taken three aspects into account. First, it wants to influence the U.S.-Soviet arms control talks at Geneva. Since they were resumed last year, these talks have now gone to the fifth round, but they have still not entered the phase of substantive "bargaining," and there is not much chance of an agreement being reached in the near future. The United States hopes that a realistic plan for reducing nuclear armaments can be discussed as soon as possible. Second, U.S. midterm elections are due in November, and Reagan needs to take a hardline attitude to reassure the right-wing conservatives. The United States plans to deploy a number of new B-52 bombers carrying cruise missiles before the end of the year; when that happens, the total number of U.S. multiwarhead missiles and aircraft will exceed the 1,320 limit set by the treaty. U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger said quite openly that this is for the purpose of reviving a "modern and effective deterrent force," to counter Soviet superiority in land-based missiles.

SALT-II was signed when there was parity between U.S. and Soviet nuclear forces. It is an agreement that seeks upward balance, and there are also many ambiguities in the text that give the two sides room for maneuver in continuing to develop their nuclear forces. The United States holds that the treaty provisions regarding multiwarhead missiles favor the Soviet Union, and that the Soviet Union has taken advantage of this loophole in the treaty to greatly develop its nuclear forces in recent years. The United States has therefore harbored the notion of changing the restriction on the number of carrier vehicles to a restriction on the number of warheads, so as to alter this aspect which is unfavorable for the United States. U.S. talks of scrapping the treaty also more or less reflects this U.S. thinking.

The current storm between the United States and the Soviet Union centered on whether to continue adhering to SALT-II also shows that there has been no relaxation in the positions of the two sides regarding disarmament. The Soviet Union has recently displayed some kind of "flexibility" while launching a vigorous "peace" offensive under the premise of making no substantial concessions. The aim of these Soviet proposals remains to pressure the United States into abandoning its "star wars" scheme, while the United States for its part seeks to force the Soviet Union to make a big reduction in its land-based intercontinental missiles. Hence, although one disarmament proposal after another has seen the light of day, not even minimal progress has ever been made at the Geneva disarmament talks. These proposals have turned into blank rounds. What now worries people in the West is that if the treaty is indeed dismantled, there will not even be a superficial restriction on the U.S.-Soviet arms race, and it is hard to predict what kind of a situation this will produce. The antagonism between the two countries will also increase.

JPRS-TAC-86-055  
15 July 1986

SALT/START ISSUES

#### BRIEFS

TASS ON MINUTEMAN-3 TEST--Washington, 15 Jun (TASS)--The Pentagon today conducted another test of the inter-continental ballistic missile Minuteman-3. The missile that was launched from the U.S. airbase Vandenberg, California, hit the target situated at a distance of 6,720 kilometers south-west of the base. The UPI news agency noted that this launching was the 120th one in a series of test flights of U.S. inter-continental ballistic missiles conducted by the U.S. Airforce. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1458 GMT 15 Jun 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1437

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

FRG CDU/CSU 'DISAPPOINTED' WITH PACT PROPOSALS

Todenhoefer Expresses 'Disappointment'

LD111810 Hamburg DPA in German 1528 GMT 11 Jun 86

[Text] Bonn, 11 Jun (DPA) — Juergen Todenhoefer, disarmament policy spokesman of the CDU/CSU Bundestag group, expressed disappointment in Bonn today with the Warsaw Pact disarmament proposals. In a statement Todenhoefer did announce that the CDU/CSU will examine the proposals, but he also regretted that they fell far short of the expectations aroused by General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev.

The East's proposals show that the Warsaw Pact wants to turn its conventional superiority into an accepted fact. In terms of figures this means 56,000 battle tanks against 16,000 NATO tanks, 7,000 artillery pieces and missile launchers against NATO's 3,060, and 7,000 tactical combat aircraft against 3,500.

Genscher's Remarks

LD121229 Hamburg DPA in German 1112 GMT 12 Jun 86

[Text] Bonn, 12 Jun (DPA) — Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher describes the statement by the Warsaw Pact states as a "reaction to be welcomed" in light of the NATO decisions made in Halifax.

NATO member states meeting in Halifax at the end of May, presented a concept for comprehensive cooperation between West and East. The call by the communist countries to deepen political dialogue with the West is an "encouraging sign" for U.S.-Soviet dialogue, Genscher said today, part of which is a new summit meeting with Soviet General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev, which U.S. President Ronald Reagan favors.

Genscher said that the readiness of the Warsaw Pact to cooperate in the fight against terrorism and also in the field of reactor security (?deserves) attention. [passage indistinct] The Federal Government welcomes all steps which reduce the existing imbalance and lead to real stability.

striking forces. However, such far-reaching offers should be fully considered in the experts' negotiations. NATO has outlined its will to deal with disarmament in the conventional field more than ever before — if the framework conditions are positive.

The Essen *WESTDEUTSCHE ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG* writes the following, headlined, Prepared for a Dialogue: As expected, the Budapest Warsaw Pact summit meeting has reiterated Gorbachev's proposal outlined at the Berlin SED Congress to reduce conventional armed forces from the Atlantic to the Urals. But what makes the Budapest summit's concrete proposals particularly interesting is the offer of effective on-the-spot verification, to which the Soviet Union has been so much opposed in the past. This could be an important key to movement at the Vienna MBFR negotiations, which have been stalemated for a long time.

The Mainz *ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG* asks: What is tactics and what is the substance of the Warsaw Pact's new declaration of intent? The newspaper goes on to say: The Soviets can face the test, not in another conference at some other place, but at the old Vienna conference table, where troop reductions in Europe have been discussed for 13 years. They can prove there whether they really want to disarm, or whether they just want to bring their military superiority down to a lower level. They should specify there what they really want to accept regarding verification.

*DIE WELT* maintains: A first assessment of the new Warsaw Pact summit proposals in Budapest regarding disarmament in Europe shows that the East has obviously just added new proposals to many old ones, the implementation of which does not match its propaganda effect. It seems that Gorbachev again demonstrated the old Soviet method, which it has tested for years, of creating new hopes in the West with a new arms control proposal. But whenever real negotiations between experts from both camps take place, it turns out — as in the long drawn-out efforts in Vienna, Geneva, and Stockholm — that the Soviets do not really want to disarm. Gorbachev is thus following the tradition of Soviet policy to bring influence to bear on the West. The reputation he had when he took over, of wanting to embark a new foreign policy of real understanding with the West, has definitely been weakened.

#### Vogel Welcomes Proposals

LD121312 Hamburg DPA in German 1226 GMT 12 Jun 86

[Text] Munich, 12 Jun (DPA) — SPD Bundestag group Chairman Hans-Jochen Vogel welcomes the Budapest Warsaw Pact proposals as being "in the right direction." "I will make sure that they are examined," Vogel told the press today on the sidelines of a conference of SPD regional and national parliamentary group chairmen in Munich. The proposals contain constructive elements. He warned that the West should not lay them aside after only a few days. I can not understand, the SPD politician continued, why some people in the West find it depressing when such disarmament initiatives come from the East.

Press on Disarmament Proposals

DW121116 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 505 GMT [as printed]  
12 Jun 86

[From the Press Review]

[Excerpts] Some editorials discuss the recent disarmament proposals made to NATO by the East.

The Freiburg *BADISCHE ZEITUNG* writes: The Warsaw Pact leaders have uttered great words. They propose that East and West should disarm up to 150,000 men, each in a relatively short time — while simultaneously the Vienna negotiations on troop reductions in Europe deal with a moderate figure of between 5,000 and 12,000 men. Are there two rival Moscow power centers at work, or is this strange discrepancy caused by the clumsy Soviet foreign service? The Budapest offer by the Eastern camp is at any rate interesting. It takes Western considerations into account that in case of clear-cut use of nuclear weapons the USSR could exploit its superior conventional

/8309

CSO: 5200/2706

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S BOVIN: U.S. ACTIONS INTENDED 'TO BLOCK SUMMIT MEETING'

PM231945 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Jun 86 Morning Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA Political Observer A. Bovin article: "Beyond Mars"]

[Text] THE WASHINGTON POST recently cited a curious observation by Paul Brown, head of the arms control program at Livermore Laboratory (one of the U.S. laboratories where nuclear weapons are developed and improved). Brown, as is the rule for those Americans who, under the current President, are engaged in "arms control," is against such control. Understandably he is also against an accord on the total prohibition of nuclear weapons tests. As a specialist, Brown knows that existing apparatus makes it possible to precisely establish possible violations of such an accord. But this is on Earth. But who and what is there to prevent the Soviet Union from taking testing in "deep space"? No one and nothing. Therefore, Brown thinks, the cunning Russians "can conduct tests in space beyond Mars and in this event we would have to fly there in order to determine the yield of the explosion." Getting into space "beyond Mars" is no easy matter. Consequently it is better to leave everything as it is and not ban tests but continue them. Here, on Earth, of course... Exquisite logic. If it is made the foundation of U.S. stances, it is perfectly possible to imagine the following turn of events. Let us suppose that in the desire to reach an agreement on strategic arms limitation, we were to agree on any form of monitoring [kontrol]. Let the Americans set just 10 monitors on each of our missiles. The answer is not difficult to foresee. "No," they will tell us once again. "No," because who knows if those Russians have not already deployed their missiles on Pluto or, what is considerably closer and easier, on Uranus.

Let us be serious. If we come back to Earth from space, it is impossible to get rid of the idea that the U.S. Administration is ready to dream up whatever it likes, and to allude to whatever it sees fit, and to do what it pleases simply to prevent the reapprochement of Soviet and American viewpoints, to make mutual understanding between the USSR and the United States more difficult if only in order to entrench itself in cold war and confrontation more deeply and more thoroughly.

Welcoming R. Reagan's assertiveness and firmness and the toughening of his policy since Geneva 1985, the conservative American organization called the Heritage Foundation compiled a list of glorious -- in its opinion -- deeds performed by the President. . I shall enumerate them:

The bombing of Libya.

The new requests for appropriations for financing the Nicaraguan "contras."

Aid to Jonas Savimbi, leader of the Angolan rebels.

The granting of Stinger antiaircraft missiles to the Afghan dushmans.

The demand for a sharp cutback in the number of Soviet diplomats accredited at the United Nations.

The refusal to make concessions at the Geneva talks on arms control.  
The refusal to introduce a moratorium on nuclear tests.  
The statement on SALT I and SALT II.  
That is the picture.

Recently, naturally, the attention of the U.S. and world public has been concentrated around the actual refusal of the U.S. President to observe the limitations contained in SALT I and SALT II. The allies are displeased and irritated. Congress is seething. U.S. journalists are writing about the "total isolation" of the President and are calling his decisions "absurd."

In order to stifle the critical voices if only to some degree, and to remove the sensation of the patent provocativeness and unconstructiveness of his policy, the President, speaking last week at Glassboro, called for people to act for the sake of peace and spoke with emphasis about a desire to reach agreement with the Soviet Union and to embark on a radical reduction of armaments, and so on and so forth. This hypocritical collection is well known to us. We have heard it in various versions and in different combinations. But it is preferable to take as a reference point not words, even pleasant ones. It is preferable to orient oneself toward deeds. But as far as deeds are concerned, they are enumerated above. If each of them is taken separately, in isolation, one could say that the President was mistaken, gave way to emotion, and overestimated America's potential. Anything can happen.... However, taken as a whole, the list, which was conscientiously compiled by the President's friends, leaves no room for such arguments. We have before us a well thought-out political line. A line toward the worsening of Soviet-American relations, spurring on the arms race, and exacerbating international tension. I may be mistaken, but I form the impression that the White House has decided, come what may, to block a new summit meeting. Provided, of course, one does not have in mind a meeting "beyond Mars"....

/8309

CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW VIEWS SHIFTING U.S. RESPONSE TO SOVIET INITIATIVES

LD191957 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 19 Jun 86

[Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] In many foreign responses on the new Soviet 5-year plan it is noted that our large-scale plans are indissolubly bound with the kind of foreign policy aimed at peaceful construction and at all-round international cooperation. It is true that if one of the most important characteristics of our plan is the speeding up of the country's socio-economic development, then for the USSR's foreign policy at the current stage a distinctive dynamism is inherent.

It is sufficient to list our major peace initiatives in recent times: the presentation of a concrete plan for full nuclear disarmament and the continuation for another 6 months of the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions; a draft agreement to eliminate Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe and the new proposal in Geneva to limit strategic offensive arms; a complete program, agreed with other socialist countries, to cut armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe; and the USSR's new initiatives to eliminate chemical weapons and to prevent the militarization of space.

It is not surprising that in the West they are beginning to speak of the new peace offensive of the Soviet Union and the rest of the socialist community. Willy Brandt, chairman of Socialist International, points out that the East has again, as it has so often done in recent times, grasped the initiative for a public discussion of the possibility of limiting arms.

What is the West, and primarily the United States, doing at the same time? Their present policy can well be called the policy of refusal: refusal to end nuclear tests, refusal to recognize existing accords on strategic arms, refusal to leave space free of weapons. True, taking into account the public mood, it seems that Western capitals, including Washington, are no longer taking the risk of repeating in all possible ways only the word "no". The governments of several West European countries have positively appraised the Budapest appeal of the Warsaw Pact states. Even in the White House this time they did not, as they usually do, reject the Soviet proposals immediately, but promised to study them seriously. In this connection, the U.S. press itself writes that Washington's administration is torn by contradictions on the question of the new Soviet proposals. Well, as the saying goes, we live and learn, but in either case, as it was stressed both at the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and at the USSR Supreme Soviet we shall continue to do in future everything possible for the preservation and strengthening of peace.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1436

15 July 1986

## RELATED ISSUES

TASS: U.S. CONSIDERS 'INSERTABLE NUCLEAR COMPONENTS'

LD160917 Moscow TASS in English 0858 GMT 16 Jun 86

[Text] Washington June 16 TASS -- TASS correspondent Igor Ignatyev reports:

The United States intends to replenish its nuclear arsenal with new weapons.

As is reported by the newspaper "WASHINGTON POST", "the Reagan administration is considering development of weapons that could be transformed from conventional to nuclear".

Almost any type of weapon can be developed to accommodate what the military calls "insertable nuclear components", according to designers at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, engaged in research in that field. The likeliest application would be to tactical weapons, such as Navy torpedoes or short-range Army missiles.

Development of such weapons would "create an arms control nightmare", "WASHINGTON POST" points out.

William M. Arkin, a nuclear weapons expert and administration critic at the Institute for Policy Studies, said that convertible weapons would make nuclear war more likely.

The U.S. Government, said prominent American expert Paul C. Warnke, should strive for eliminating tactical nuclear armaments but not for creating new types of these armaments.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

TASS REPORTS ON PUGWASH GENEVA MEETING

Meeting Opens

LD140955 Moscow TASS in English 0834 GMT 14 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva June 14 TASS -- An international Pugwash meeting which has opened here is devoted to the discussion of the most vitally important issue of today -- the problem of nuclear and space arms. The participants in the meeting will discuss the need to observe the provisions of the SALT-2 treaty and to end underground nuclear test, the problem of averting the threat of nuclear war, possibilities for reducing strategic arms and for reaching agreements on medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe as well as other problems. The attention of those present at the meeting is focused on the address by the Warsaw Treaty member-countries to NATO member-states [word indistinct] to all European countries with a programme to reduce the armed forces and conventional arms in Europe.

The two-day meeting is being attended by prominent scientists, public figures and experts on military affairs from many countries.

Urges Observance of SALT II

LD170513 Moscow TASS in English 0114 GMT 17 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva June 16 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vladislav Shishlo reports:

The existing arms control agreements, although not perfect, still ensured a possibility of curbing the arms race to some extent, says a statement of the Executive Committee of the Pugwash Movement published today. It was adopted on the results of the Pugwash meeting of scientists, public figures and experts on military problems from 18 countries held here.

The participants in the meeting came to the conclusion that although the SALT-2 treaty was not ratified, it was observed in its main parameters.

The turning down of the observance of the treaty can lead to the upsetting of the balance of forces, to the growth of expenditures on the arms race and to a greater danger of the outbreak of a war.

This is why it is necessary to observe the SALT-2 treaty until it is replaced by corresponding agreements on a more large-scale reduction of strategic armaments.

It is also important to observe the anti-ballistic missile (ABM) treaty in order to prevent a further stepping up of the arms race, the statement continues.

15 July 1986

In addition to the observance of the SALT-2 and ABM treaties, the arms control regime should be consolidated through a ban on the testing and deployment of anti-satellite weapons and on nuclear explosions and through achieving a mutual reduction of conventional armaments in Europe.

The participants in the meeting emphasized that the only way to rid the world of the danger of a nuclear war was to eliminate nuclear weapons.

Speaking at a press conference, the participants in the meeting from the USSR, the U.S., Britain and Italy pointed out the need for the early reaching of agreements on nuclear and space weapons with a view to putting an end to the arms race and warding off the nuclear war threat.

Touching upon the problem of the observance of the SALT-2 treaty, Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, head of a department of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, pointed out that at the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member states held in Budapest the socialist countries had stated that they would strictly observe the existing treaties and arms control agreements and had urged the NATO countries to follow this example.

#### Karpov Meets Leaders

LD172045 Moscow TASS in English 2035 GMT 17 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva June 17 TASS -- Viktor Karpov, head of the Soviet delegation to the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments, met here today with Dr Martin Kaplan, general secretary of the International Pugwash Movement, and Professor Bernard Feld, chairman of the movement's executive committee.

The Soviet side set out the USSR's principled approach to arms control problems, directed at preventing an arms in outer space, ending it on earth and eliminating all nuclear weapons by the turn of the century. It was shown that the USSR's practical proposals at the talks ensured everything necessary for the earliest reaching of effective mutually acceptable agreements in this field. On their part, the representatives of the Pugwash movement highly assessed the Soviet Union's positive steps directed at averting the nuclear threat and strengthening universal security. They pointed to the great importance of the USSR's unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

TASS: WORLD PEACE COUNCIL ON UN DISARMAMENT-DEVELOPMENT FORUM

LD091610 Moscow TASS in English 1525 GMT 9 Jun 86

[Text] Helsinki June 9 TASS -- The World Peace Council issued today the following statement: "On the United Nations Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development."

The World Peace Council and the national movements represented in it from over 140 countries of all continents are deeply concerned at the efforts being made by certain governments to postpone the convening of the United Nations Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development, which is scheduled to open in Paris on July 15, 1986.

The Government of the United States of America, after declaring that it would not participate in the conference, has been pressing other governments to join it in acting to prevent the conference from taking place. It is now reported that the new French Government -- the government of the host country -- is demanding a "postponement" of the conference on the utterly false plea that preparations for the conference are inadequate.

The United Nations decision to convene this conference on the relationship between two key issues facing all humanity, was warmly welcomed and supported by governments and world public opinion. Preparations have been continuing on all continents. Non-governmental organisations have joined the member states of the United Nations in holding numerous preparatory events for the Paris conference. Numerous studies and documents are ready for discussion. The perilous arms build-up has reached new heights in recent weeks -- with the U.S. announcement of its decision to violate SALT II, with the NATO agreement for the speeding up of production of sophisticated chemical weapons by Washington, with the intensification of the U.S. "star wars" preparations and the carrying out of several U.S. nuclear weapon tests in Nevada.

The problems facing scores of developing countries -- famine, hunger, poverty, and external debt -- have been highlighted at the special session of the U.N. General Assembly on the crisis in Africa. Never was the need greater than today for multilateral discussions and negotiations on the relationship between disarmament and development.

The World Peace Council urges all peace and anti-war movements, all non-governmental organisations which stand for a world without nuclear weapons, without hunger and poverty -- to join hands to urge the United Nations to hold this conference on the relationship between disarmament and development without delay.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW RELIGIOUS ROUND TABLE ON ARMS RACE, POVERTY

PM300855 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 May 86 Morning Edition p 4

[V. Kondrashov report: "Call to Action"]

[Text] A roundtable conference on problems of combating hunger, poverty, and the arms race organized by the working presidium of the World Conference of Religious Leaders has ended in Moscow. Taking part in the round table were 70 religious leaders, as well as well known experts from nearly 30 countries. All the planet's continents were represented here, and all the world's main religions -- Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, Judaism, Islam.

Pimen, Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia, sent a message of greetings to the participants in the conference, which was chaired by Pavel mar Grigoriy metropolitan of Delhi and Northern India. "It is the inhuman, immoral policy of preserving and even stepping up the nuclear arms race, the policy of militarization of outer space," he stressed, "which lead to the growth of poverty and hunger among broad strata of the population of many states."

The religious leaders and experts discussed the latest information about the interconnection between the arms race, on the one hand, and hunger and poverty on the other, and examined the problems of countries which are in acute need of peaceful economic development, in which they could be helped considerably by the resources which are now spent on the production of weapons of mass destruction.

In a communique adopted unanimously on the last day of the meeting, the participants in the roundtable conference expressed their concern at a whole series of new acts of aggression: The United States against Libya; South Africa against Zimbabwe, Botswana, and against Angola. "The white minority regime in South Africa," the communique notes, "is following the example of its 'historical ally' -- the United States."

The participants in the Moscow meeting expressed their sympathy for the families of those killed as a result of the Chernobyl AES accident, and also expressed regret that "certain circles are spreading lies in the mass media and utilizing the accident for the purpose of cheap political propaganda."

The communique points out that the participants in the roundtable sent letters to M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, U.S. President R. Reagan, and the leaders of the six states -- Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden, and Tanzania.

"Man must serve the ideas of peace," Moulavi Gulyam Sarvar Mansur, a prominent religious leader from Afghanistan and representative of the DRA Supreme Council of Theologians and Religious Leaders, stated in a talk with IZVESTIYA's correspondent. "American imperialism is a threat to peace, stalking the world like a hungry jackal in pursuit of profit. The United States uses the most modern types of weapons to achieve its base objectives and suppress the peoples' striving for freedom. It is trying to stifle the Afghan people's freedom too and to divert our material resources from the tasks mapped out by the revolution. But the Afghan people are not alone in their struggle against the forces of counterrevolution and imperialism. We are grateful for the help which the Soviet Union gives us. Here at the roundtable conference we have seen once again the humanism of Soviet foreign policy evokes the sincere respect of the world public, including religious circles."

"I am very pleased with the work of the roundtable conference," the well-known Greek public figure General Yeoryios Koumankakos, retired, who was at the meeting as an expert, stated "It showed that the ranks of those who fight against the arms race and for peace and the peoples' prosperity are swelling. I am profoundly convinced that the Soviet Union's position on disarmament questions is a positive factor in the attainment of these goals. We fully approved M.S. Gorbachev's statement on the Soviet Union's decision to extend the nuclear test moratorium until 6 August. This is further evidence of the USSR's courage and nobility in its approach to the vital issues disturbing mankind. It gives new strength to all who value the cause of peace."

A delegation of prominent representatives of the roundtable conference headed by Metropolitan Filaret of Minsk and Belorussia was received at the USSR Supreme Soviet.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

TASS REPORTS ON SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS IN LIMA

CPSU Greetings

LD221455 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1125 GMT 22 Jun 86

[Greetings message from the CPSU Central Committee to the 17th Congress of the Socialist International]

[Text] Moscow, 22 Jun (TASS) -- Esteemed delegates! Your congress is discussing problems on whose solution the future of mankind depends.

The danger of a nuclear disaster hangs over the world community like a threatening shadow. Today it is a question of the survival of civilization -- perhaps the only civilization in the universe.

In October 1985, the Socialist International called on the United States and the Soviet Union to do everything possible to achieve a change of direction away from the policy of armament and toward a course aimed at preserving life on earth in conditions of peace, freedom, and respect for human dignity.

As you undoubtedly know, since then the Soviet Union has taken a number of major steps toward facilitating and accelerating that change of direction.

We have extended until 6 August 1986 our unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions and have proposed reaching an urgent agreement to ban nuclear tests;

In our declaration of 15 January, we set out a clear and concrete plan to abolish nuclear and other mass-destruction weapons by the end of the present century and to reduce other armaments to the limits of rational adequacy [razumnaya dostatochnost];

We have put forward appropriate proposals for abolishing Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe and also operational and tactical nuclear armaments, in view of the alarm also felt by Europeans;

We have put forward compromise proposals, meeting the West halfway, at the talks in Vienna and Stockholm and also at the disarmament conference in Geneva -- in the section dealing with banning and destroying chemical weapons as soon as possible under strict international control;

The Soviet Union has with the utmost clarity expressed its advocacy of effective control in all aspects of arms limitation, including international forms of verification, right up to on-site inspections.

All these initiatives are directed toward realizing the program put forward by the 27th CPSU Congress on creating an all-embracing system of international security.

The Warsaw Pact member-states recently presented to the NATO member-states and all European countries a comprehensive program on reducing armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

With goodwill on the part of the United States, the reversal from increasing armaments to limiting and reducing them would be completely possible.

The USSR-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva engendered hope for an improvement in the international situation. Unfortunately, we have not met with a commensurate response, as you know, from the U.S. Administration, which is acting in contradiction to the letter and spirit of the joint Soviet-U.S. statement of 21 November 1985.

In the light of the U.S. Administration's refusal to join in the moratorium on nuclear tests and its announced intention to cease observing in the future the 1979 treaty on limiting strategic offensive weapons (SALT II), it is becoming wholly obvious that a course has been taken toward stepping up confrontation and toward an unlimited increase in armaments and the attainment of military superiority.

Claims by one state of the right to impose upon others its own will and its own "model" of development are impermissible. The policy of diktat and force can be fraught with the most grievous consequences for mankind.

The nuclear age requires a new way of thinking and a sober evaluation of the realities of the modern world, in which various sociopolitical systems and many dozens of states with their own legitimate interests exist -- a dynamic, changing, varied, and highly contradictory world.

Faced with problems applying to mankind in general, and above all with the problem of the survival of civilization, our world is becoming increasingly interdependent. The fact that no single state can bank any longer on defending itself solely through military-technical means is one of the realities of the nuclear age. Safeguarding security has become above all a political task, and this task must be accomplished through political means.

The road to national security is to be found through mutual security and security for all. Proceeding from this fact, we call on all governments, parties, public organizations, and movements which are truly concerned with the prospect of peace on earth to act for the creation of a comprehensive system of international security.

Our proposals concerning the basic principles of such a system of security -- in the military, political, economic, and humanitarian spheres -- were put forward in the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th congress. These principles could serve as the point of departure and framework for a direct and systematic dialogue between the leaders of the countries of the world community. By adhering to them it would be possible to achieve a situation in which peaceful coexistence could become a supreme, universal principle of interstate relations.

Aware of its historical responsibility as the ruling party of one of the nuclear powers, the CPSU considers the struggle to halt the arms race and to maintain and strengthen universal peace to be the main direction of its activity in the international arena. We are ready to energetically seek and actively exploit any, even the slimmest, chance to break the trend toward the increase of military danger.

Great importance is attached in the Soviet Union to collectively seeking a political settlement of existing conflict situations in Central America, in southern Africa and in the Near and Middle East. We resolutely condemn all forms of terrorism, including state terrorism.

Stopping the arms race and eliminating hotbeds of military danger means not only stopping the slide toward war but also freeing the resources necessary to solve economic and social problems -- including, it stands to reason, those of the developing countries -- to combat hunger, poverty, and diseases, and to maintain the natural environment in a condition fit for future generations to live in.

The Soviet leadership is aware of the fact that there is a long and hard struggle ahead. But we shall not swerve from the course mapped out even if someone wants to force us to "slam the door" [as received].

It is necessary without fail to win the battle against war. The growing support for the demands of peace and disarmament by the international public, the influence of which is these days acquiring particular importance, is a guarantee for success in this battle.

We therefore hold in high esteem the appropriate efforts of the Socialist International, an influential political force in the international arena. We also value the initiatives of the "Palme Commission," of the leaders of the "Delhi Six" countries, and of all who seek ways to stop confrontation and who strive to assist mutual understanding, dialogue, and negotiations. The search for paths toward peace is a task for everyone.

The United Nations Organization has declared 1986 International Peace Year. The best way to actually bring this about would be a complete halt in the immediate future of nuclear tests and the conclusion of an international agreement completely banning nuclear weapons tests.

Attention to nuclear issues has recently been enhanced. People are better aware of the abyss which will open if a nuclear war is unleashed upon mankind. There is also a growing understanding of the need to multiply efforts in the struggle against nuclear weapons tests and the struggle to eliminate these weapons, and the need to strengthen international conditions for the safe development of atomic power engineering.

We wish the congress success in its work.

The CPSU Central Committee.

### Speakers Criticize Arms Race

LD231149 Moscow TASS in English 1112 GMT 23 Jun 86

[Text] Lima June 23 TASS -- Problems of safeguarding peace and curbing the arms race are high on the agenda of the 17th Congress of the Socialist International which is taking place in the Peruvian capital. Speakers criticize the intention of the White House to violate the Soviet-American SALT-2 treaty and stress that these actions of the U.S. Administration can lead to catastrophe.

Speaking on behalf of several socialist and social democratic parties of a number of countries, Kalevi Sorsa, chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Finland and prime minister of the country, called for the establishment of a strategic balance in the world, for substantial cuts in the nuclear arms arsenals and against the plans to militarize space. The world has no confidence of the morrow because huge quantities of nuclear weapons have been stockpiled on earth.

There can be no winners in nuclear war: every antagonist will lose.

The first secretary of the French Socialist Party, Lionel Jospin, called for treaties to curb the arms race and stressed the need to establish nuclear weapon-free zone.

The participants in the forum passed a resolution on the problems of Latin America and Caribbean. One of the central elements of that document is the crisis which arose in Central America through the fault of the USA. The resolution denounces Reagan administration's policy of gross pressure towards Nicaragua as it can provoke a major armed conflict in Central America. The delegates to the congress of the Socialist International called against the conduct of military exercises with the participation of foreign troops in that region and for non-aggression treaties between Central American countries.

The resolution also voices solidarity with the struggle of the peoples of Chile and Paraguay against the reactionary regimes in their countries and for the restoration of democracy. The participants in the forum also urged Britain immediately to begin talks with Argentina on the sovereignty of the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands.

Willi Brandt of West Germany was re-elected the chairman of the Socialist International and Pentti Vaaenaenen its secretary general.

Congress Manifesto

LD241327 Moscow TASS in English 1259 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Text] Lima June 24 TASS -- The 17th Congress of the Socialist International has closed here with the adoption of a Lima Manifesto, which stresses the vital need of curbing the arms race and safeguarding world peace.

The halting of nuclear explosions and an eventual total nuclear test ban, the manifesto says, would be evidence that the nuclear-armed countries approach in all seriousness the problem of arms control. The U.S. Government, the document continues should at long last renounce nuclear testing. In addition, the talks with the USSR on a complete and universal nuclear test ban, interrupted by the USA and Britain in 1980, should be immediately resumed.

All the nuclear-armed countries should become involved in these talks.

The participants in the congress noted the great importance of unilateral and multilateral measures to strengthen peace and promote international detente, and of any steps aimed at limiting and reducing armaments and curbing the arms race as a whole.

The final document of the forum expresses grave worry over the U.S. plans to militarize outer space. Space should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. The 1972 ABM Treaty between the USSR and the USA, the manifesto says, should be preserved and strengthened. It is necessary to prevent the deployment of such systems anywhere, on earth or in outer space. It is also vitally important to establish nuclear weapon-free zones in the world.

The document voices the need for a total ban on chemical weapons and for an end to their production and deployment.

Weapons of any type must not be improved but policy must because universal security cannot be guaranteed through the renovation and stockpiling of weaponry. Peace and disarmament are inviolable conditions of the development, freedom and very survival of mankind. Nuclear war, the manifesto says, would constitute a crime against humanity.

The Lima Manifesto attaches much importance to the economic problems of developing countries, which are a consequence of the crisis gripping the entire capitalist economy. The difficulties of the developing countries are aggravated by their foreign indebtedness and by unequal trade and economic relations with developed Western countries.

The participants in the forum called for a peaceful settlement of the crisis in Central America, for the just solution of the Namibian and Middle East problems, and for political solutions to conflicts in other parts of the world. They denounced the apartheid regime in South Africa and acts of repression unleashed by the reactionary dictatorships in Chile and Paraguay.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: PHYSICIANS AGAINST NUCLEAR WAR HOLD HIROSHIMA SYMPOSIUM

Worldwide Appeal

OW140527 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 13 Jun 86

[Vykhukhalev report]

[Text] An international symposium of physicians on the issue of preventing nuclear war was held in Hiroshima yesterday. Our Tokyo correspondent, Vykhukhalev, reports on the symposium:

The symposium was attended by more than 700 physicians including members of a delegation of IPPNW -- the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War -- cochaired by Soviet Academician Chazov and U.S. Professor Lown. Its slogan was "Let us survive together and let us not die!"

Hiroshima Mayor Araki, addressing the symposium, noted that the symposium, held at a time when humanity finds itself in the greatest crisis in history, is extremely significant.

He then said: A positive effort to solidify peace has never been needed so much as it is now. CPSU General Secretary Gorbachev recently made proposals for holding a USSR-U.S. summit in Hiroshima and for extending the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions through 6 August. The proposals demonstrate anew what great expectations mankind attaches to Hiroshima. It is believed that Hiroshima should play a special role in saving mankind from the danger of nuclear war, and that it can do so.

The symposium adopted an IPPNW, appeal from Hiroshima, which states: In view of the grave world situation, the IPPNW has decided to appeal from here, the city that was subjected to the world's first atomic bombing -- Hiroshima -- for heeding our diagnosis calling for an immediate moratorium on all nuclear explosions. A halt to nuclear testing is an effective, practical step toward a solution to the urgent tasks of abolishing mass lethal weapons. The IPPNW appeals from Hiroshima to all physicians, peoples and governments: Let us act now before it is too late!

Meanwhile, Prof Barnard Lown said in an interview: Our visit to Japan is very important for our movement. The nuclear age began right here. Nuclear weapons saw their first victims here in Hiroshima. People all over the world should be fully aware of the lesson of Hiroshima. It is believed that the IPPNW movement will expand and gain strength in Japan as it did in the United States and the Soviet Union.

Academician Yevgeniy Chazov said: It is hoped that our visit to Hiroshima will lead to revitalizing the IPPNW movement and to increased IPPNW membership, particularly in Japan. Seeing the result of nuclear war with their own eyes will help physicians all over the world to hate nuclear bombs. At the same time, it will primarily help bring nuclear testing to an end.

#### Tokyo Press Conference

LD151255 Moscow TASS in English 1031 GMT 14 Jun 86

[Text] Tokyo, Jun 14 TASS--Professor Bernard Lown (USA), co-chairman of the "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" (IPPNW) movement, has stated that nuclear weapons pose the greatest-ever threat to mankind. If they are used, medicine would prove powerless to help their victims or to rid the world's population of the consequences of a "nuclear winter." He said there was only one way to save civilization: to prevent a nuclear conflict. With this end in view it is essential, first of all, to end all nuclear tests. Mr Lown spoke here today at a press conference on the results of the trip to Japan by a widely-representative IPPNW delegation which was headed, together with Mr Lown, by academician Yevgeniy Chazov (USSR), co-chairman of the movement.

The U.S. scientist pointed out that the rests of nuclear weapons were whipping up the arms race and were opening the way for the production and deployment of new, more sophisticated systems of destruction. He positively assessed the Soviet Union's decision to extend its unilateral moratorium until August 6 of this year, and emphasized that physicians of the world were demanding that the U.S. Administration join the initiative.

Mr Lown criticised the "star wars" programme which is being publicized by Washington as a certain shield which would be ostensibly capable of protecting the USA against nuclear threat. He said there could be no shield against nuclear weapons, and that all talk about that was neither more nor less than a dangerous illusion. The deployment of the so-called space defence systems would only increase the risk of outbreak of nuclear war. He said the USA could not afford to implement such a costly and senseless programme.

Professor Lown said America which could not feed 20 million of its citizens was too poor for that.

The participants in the press conference rejected the assertions being circulated in the west that the Soviet Union is allegedly concealing information on the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station. Ian Maddocks (Australia) and Lars Engstedt (Sweden), vice-presidents of the IPPNW, said that at the last IPPNW congress in Cologne they had received exhaustive data from Soviet colleagues on what had happened in Chernobyl.

Statement by Lown, Chazov

OW151417 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 0300 GMT  
15 Jun 86

[Text] An international symposium of physicians has been held in Hiroshima at the proposal of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War [IPPNW]. Station reporter Vykhushakev reports:

More than 700 physicians from many countries attended the symposium, which adopted an appeal for immediately stopping all nuclear tests.

Lown, Harvard University professor, and Chazov, Soviet academician, both of whom are co-chairmen of the IPPNW, signed the appeal.

[Begin Lown recording in English] The visit to Japan is extraordinarily important for our movement because this is where the atomic age started. This is where the first [words indistinct] victims. [end recording]

Lown said: The visit to Japan is extraordinarily important for our movement because this is where the nuclear age started, and nuclear weapons claimed their first victims here. The people throughout the world should be fully aware of the lesson of Hiroshima. Professor Lown said: The Soviet view is very important. It has three times extended the time limits for unilaterally suspending nuclear tests.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

KARPOV SAID TO HEAD NEW USSR FOREIGN MINISTRY ARMS SECTION

AU171255 Paris AFP in English 1243 GMT 17 Jun 86

[Excerpt] Geneva, June 17 (AFP) -- Victor Karpov, 58, chief Soviet delegate at the superpower nuclear and space arms talks here, is to head a new Soviet Foreign Ministry section on "arms reduction and disarmament," a Soviet source said Tuesday.

The section would handle all current negotiations, covering both long-range strategic and medium-range missiles, and the U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative -- "Star Wars" -- space defence project, the source added.

The Soviet ministry also apparently envisaged setting up a section to handle "nuclear and space cooperation," the source said.

It was not known if Mr. Karpov, an affable disarmament veteran, would leave Geneva. But it seemed possible he would continue to lead the Soviet negotiating team here.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

CSSR ACADEMICIAN ADDRESSES MOSCOW FORUM ON PEACE, ENVIRONMENT

LD282005 Prague CTK in English 1200 GMT 28 May 86

[Text] Moscow May 28 (CTK correspondent)--Josef Riman, president of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences and head of its delegation at the all-union conference of Soviet scientists opened here Tuesday, today addressed the conference with a speech on problems of peace and environmental protection.

In his address, Riman said all nations should unite their efforts to solve the serious economic and social problems of the developing countries, warning that the tendency towards a major social and economic crisis is likely to be accelerated in the future due to the poor stability of the global ecological system.

He also said most of the finances that could be used for solving global problems were being swallowed by continuing world armament.

"The earth' ecological system itself, already badly harmed, demands an immediate ban on any use of destructive weapons and further nuclear testing," he stressed.

Riman praised the Soviet peace proposals and criticized the United States, saying feverish armament and military aggression have become major features of its policy.

"The strategy of imperialism takes into account neither the objective social reality of today's world, nor the current ecological state of the earth," he stressed.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S PETROVSKIY ON FOREIGN MINISTRY RESHUFFLE, ARMS ISSUES

PM191136 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 17 Jun 86 p 12

[Interview with Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister V.F. Petrovskiy by Andrea Tarquini in Budapest; date not given]

[Text] Budapest -- "Due notice was issued of that major meeting at the ministry, so we experienced several days of expectation and waiting. For those at the start of their careers it was very exciting, while we oldsters, with so many postings and memories behind us, sought vainly through our records and recollections.

"Never before had a CPSU general secretary decided to address all us ambassadors in person. Not even Stalin during the war or following the victory." During a brief respite between a press conference and a meeting Vladimir Fedorovich Petrovskiy was taking half an hour's rest, loosening his unseasonably warm blue suit. Sitting on a small sofa in a room at the Hilton, he examined me with his very lively dark eyes, while unenthusiastically sipping a tonic water (the new style demands certain sacrifices).

We heard from him -- one of Shevardnadze's most highly rated deputies -- about that agonizing reappraisal of diplomacy in what was (at least as far as we know) the first "secret report" delivered by Gorbachev.

"We heard vigorous criticisms and exhortations in his report and in the ensuing debate," Petrovskiy said in his strongly accented but excellent English. "Mikhail Sergeyevich was determined to wage the battle begun at the congress within our ranks too. There was a single order, in two parts: We must formulate and pursue a foreign policy that will implement the pointers of the party congress, of which it will become and remain an integral and active part."

[Tarquini] Could you explain that better?

[Petrovskiy] I will try. The first requirement is that foreign policy meet the country's internal needs. At the congress Gorbachev launched a program of renewal and reforms. Therefore we strategists and ambassadors must no longer fall behind. The country must work harder and better. This must apply to us too. The rewards will go to those who are capable and creative, not to careerists and adherents to stereotypes. Well, this rule will apply to our own ranks and make itself felt. The USSR needs peace, dialogue, and economic cooperation to live a better life and to modernize itself. Very well, foreign policy, in all its aspects, must be not a curb to but a mainstay of and driving force behind this blueprint.

[Tarquini] A major reshuffle is under way in your ministry and all the major embassies. Basically this is the end of the Gromyko era....

[Petrovskiy] Yes, the impact is very great: I would say that the impact on the personal level is equal to that on the political level. The most important thing is the present political task and the pointers for us that will derive from it. We must work with the utmost efficiency for cooperation with all countries -- cooperation as the contrary of conflict. It is also natural that generations such as mine, which experienced the war and the fifties, should either strive to change or stand aside. But, I repeat, it is the political orientation that is the prime issue.

[Tarquini] Are you not also coming to terms with what we might call a problem of image? The seventies -- what with Angola, Kabul, and the SS-20's -- left us with an aggressive and militaristic image of the USSR....

[Petrovskiy] True, image making is one of the phenomena of politics. But images are not reality. They can help forge reality but they are only a secondary aspect of it. Now, however, in this shrinking world, rather than building another image, we are concerned with achieving things, establishing cooperation with everyone. The most important thing is to realize that we are all interdependent. I have in mind how we are all the prisoners of technologies and accidents... you know, Chernobyl has taught us a great deal in this respect, has caused us to ponder the need for safety and the role of information. It has made us realize that we are all passengers on the same space shuttle or on a single aircraft.

[Tarquini] Yes, but will it be an interdependence between equals? Your parity with America seems to be faltering.

[Petrovskiy] Well, I would put it differently. Parity is not a demand, a claim: It derives from strategic, political, and all other kinds of realities. And we feel equal to them, both militarily and politically. In certain fields we may perhaps be behind them, but a basic parity exists.

The problem is a different one. By denying us parity, the Americans grow stronger with respect to both the allies and the Third World. This seems to me to be their aim.

[Tarquini] Even assuming this to be the case, their strategy could be a winning one. Consider the abandonment of SALT II. Does that not pose a problem for you?

[Petrovskiy] Yes, but we can only respond by maintaining positions of equality in all negotiating forums. If they tell us "no" so much the worse for them. We cannot do anything else, in any field. As for SALT, we still hope that Washington will reconsider. As long as they observe it, so will we.

[Tarquini] But a further process of rearmament will destroy your plans for reform....

[Petrovskiy] No. That is to say, it would be much easier to resolve our internal problems within a favorable, more relaxed international context.

Rearmament could have a negative impact on our reforms, but we will not be the ones to start it.

[Tarquini] One final question, Vladimir Fedorovich: When Gorbachev addressed KGB cadres do you believe he urged them on as he did you?

[Petrovskiy] Ha, ha. How can I answer you? That building which used to belong to Count Rostopchin is very fine, but I do not live there.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1436

END